DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 791 FL 002 145

AUTHOR	Brooks, Nelson
TITLE	Speaking of Language.
INSTITUTION	Modern Language Association of America, New York, N.Y. ERIC Clearinghouse on the Teaching of Foreign Languages.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	172p.
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Articulation (Program), *Audiolingual Methods, Audiovisual Instruction, Cultural Education, Educational Development, Educational Objectives, Educational Psychology, Instructional Program Divisions, Instructional Technology, *Language Instruction, Language Proficiency, Language Skills, *Language Teachers, Literature, *Modern Languages, Program Evaluation, *Speeches, Teaching Methods

ABSTRACT

Fourteen selected speeches dating from 1955 to 1969 cover a broad range of information relevant to the history of language instruction in American schools. A state-of-the-art review of language instruction, written in 1955, precedes papers on: (1) language proficiency; (2) school and college language program cooperation; (3) motion pictures in teacher education; (4) applied educational psychology; (5) teaching methodology; (6) humanizing foreign language instruction; (7) testing of language, culture, and literature; (8) art and mechanics in language instruction; (9) program articulation; (10) teaching culture; and (11) foreign language instruction in Georgia. Many problems and aspects of theory which strongly influenced the development of audiolingual language instruction are discussed in the speeches. (RL)

ED048791

SPEAKING OF LANGUAGE

Nelson Brooks

Yale University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

1971

FL002145

ERIC
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
62 Fifth Avenue,
New York, New York 10011

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Prologue. 1

How Modern Is a Modern Language Teacher?(December 1955). 3

Instruction in Foreign Languages: The State of the Art (April 1963) 12

What Is Language Proficiency? (November 1964). 23

School-College Collaboration and the FL Learner (March 1965). 33

Motion Pictures in Teacher Education: Ideas and Applications in Language Instruction (June 1966). 41

My Concerns about the Application of Psychology to Instruction (August 1966). . 51

Theory and Practice of Language Instruction (September 1966). 65

Humanizing Instruction through Foreign Language Study (May 1967). 78

Testing for the Three Objectives: Language, Culture, Literature (September 1967). 93

Art and Mechanics in FL Instruction (October 1967). 110

The Role of Secondary Education in Foreign Language Learning (November 1967). .125

Teaching Culture in the Language Class (April 1968). 136

Following the Language Learner from School to College (April 1968). 153

Foreign Language Instruction and Georgia (October 1969). 164

PROLOGUE

When a speech appears in print, the message takes on the calm uniformity of a page of type. Not in evidence is the malaise that seizes the speaker before he receives his cue to begin. Unheard are the squeaks and crackles of the wayward microphone. Absent are the eloquent footsteps of those who walk out while the speech is in progress. But the major lack is the intangible tie that binds speaker and hearers in a common cause. The expectancy of the audience is both a challenge and a support to the person speaking. Terrain is won in terms of the listeners' active participation in the sharing of projects and ideas.

The reader of the scripts that follow is invited to summon up as best he can the three-dimensional reality of the lecture hall, and to supply with his imagination the intonations, the hesitancies, the vocal emphases that writing cannot capture.

The time span covered by these talks is the better part of two decades. The topics discussed are many and varied. The reader of the 70's will do well to recall or to recognize the discouraging state in which foreign language teaching found itself in the middle 50's. There was need for new ideas and new plans, and for their acceptance. There was need for action.

The common theme that may be said to unite these diverse talks is the realization that a foreign language is not only something you observe and analyze and wonder at--it is also something you do. Foreign language learning is not only an intellectual discipline, it is a performing art. Putting this concept into practice did nothing to make teaching easier. But FL teachers were not looking for less to do, rather, they were seeking ways of channeling their efforts and making them more productive.

The present-day reader will find in these talks an echo of matters that were on the minds of those wrestling with the problem of making FL teaching different and better--above all, of making it come alive. If there are passages that are hortatory, that was needful; if anguished, that was typical. But these do not purport to be the words of a Moses just down from Mount Sinai. Rather, they are the thoughts of a laborer in the field, who was convinced that by proper pruning in the spring, by diligent cultivation throughout the season, by patient waiting for the time of harvest, there could be obtained the vintage yield of which the vines and the soil are capable.

Nelson Brooks
Yale University
April 1971

HOW MODERN IS A MODERN LANGUAGE TEACHER?*

by

Nelson Brooks

Yale University

How modern _is_ a modern language teacher? For this question I have a personal, singular answer. I shall use the pronoun _I_ and present my case in the accusative. Forgive me. I am about to set your teeth on edge.

I have been a teacher of modern languages in school and college for twenty-five years. I have recently visited many language classes, elementary and advanced, in schools and colleges in seven states from New Hampshire to Georgia. I have been made happy and proud by the good things I have seen. I have been scandalized and angered by the bad things I have seen. I regret to admit that the bad far outweigh the good.

I am convinced that we who teach contemporary languages must squarely face a host of unwelcome truths about what we do and what we achieve. We deserve no applause that many rooms in our house are clean and neat. The scandal is that there should be any rooms at all that are not in order.

For the present state of affairs I accuse the leaders in our profession who have shown too little concern for the welfare of the youthful language learner.

I accuse the professional organizations that have shown a bland unwillingness to deal with problems that are crucial, not only to the youthful learner, but to every member of our profession.

I accuse those who write and publish our textbooks with having misled our students as to the very nature of language and how it is learned.

---

* A talk delivered at the Seventieth Annual Meeting of the Modern Language Association, Chicago, December 29, 1955.

I accuse those who administer our schools with not having understood the nature of the problems that language teaching presents.

I accuse those who give guidance counsel to our students with not having understood the significance of continuity in language learning.

I accuse American-born language teachers of not knowing enough about English or enough about the learning of a second language.

I accuse foreign-born language teachers of not knowing enough about American schools or enough about what it is like to learn their language as a second language when English has been learned first.

I accuse the schools that turn their language classes into mere training courses for surmounting the hurdle of college entrance.

I accuse the colleges that conduct their courses in English to the disillusion of the increasing number of students who enter well prepared to take such courses in the foreign language.

I accuse both schools and colleges of inexcusable ignorance of what their students' language learning experience will be in the future or has been in the past.

In the name of our students, I demand freedom from:

the museum of Latin
the ubiquity of English
the obliquity of the book
the treadmill of translation
the straight-jacket of grammar
the crutches of word-lists and paradigms
the overload of literature
the boogyman of College Entrance Board Examinations.

The study of a contemporary language can never be the same as the study of Latin. The lady for whom the garments of Roman speech were designed is long since dead; in the case of the modern languages the lady is alive and vigorous. I am asked to acknowledge that Latin *is* still alive today, and in a certain sense, even outside the church, it is. Latin is part and parcel of present-day English. That I am what I am because my great-great-grandfather was what *he* was is only too true--and the science of genetics demonstrates this as clearly as the history of languages does. But if you maintain that my great-great-grandfather is *alive* in the sense that my brothers and my sisters and my cousins are alive, I cannot agree. The cause of both Latin and the modern languages will best be served by recognizing that they are different and dealing with each accordingly.

For the second language learner, English is a mother-in-law, whose best contribution to the new ménage of student mind and second language is a benevolent and prolonged absence. Every living language has a uniqueness and a self-sufficiency that make it absolutely independent of any other. No language exists that is a mere obbligato of another, no language exists that is a mere function of another. Yet such is the impression given by innumerable textbooks in their end-vocabularies, footnotes, marginal hints, exercises, and so-called "word studies". Every language there is, like every person in this audience, has a right to be known and evaluated on its own merits, without being constantly coupled and compared with and overshadowed by another. Mother-in-law, English, go home!

The priority of speech over writing is as plain as a pikestaff--yet we habitually present our beginning language student on the first day with a two-pound book. This book immediately becomes and remains the center of gravity of class work, homework, tests, and grades. In truth, the student asks for bread and we give him a stone. George Santayana once wrote a sentence that I am fond of quoting: "Criticism surprises the soul in the arms of convention." This I like to paraphrase: "Criticism surprises the language teacher in the arms of a textbook publisher." How many times have teachers said to me: "But I have to do this...I *can't* do that...

because of the book I am using." Must we be slaves to a well-bound handful of printed pages that we neither like nor respect?

One source of trouble with our textbooks is our having naively thought that preparing a textbook was virtually the same as preparing a work of literary research. It concerned a teacher-scholar (perhaps two), a typewriter, books, libraries, time, and a publishing company. We have overlooked the fact that every language textbook project ever conceived concerns not only the teacher-scholar, but also the psychologist, the phonetician, the linguist, the cultural anthropologist, and the expert in literature. All these people must contribute their counsel if the textbook is to be what a textbook should be, an instrument to help the student learn.

Still more serious is the fact that, as a profession, we have abdicated our position as arbiters of what and how our students shall learn from books and, by default, we have yielded the editorial and critical function in this area to those whose first concern is to make a financial profit. No far-reaching or permanent improvement can come about in foreign language teaching until we who are responsible again establish our authority over the nature and content of the tools we put into our students' hands.

Why does translation still raise its battered head in so many of our classes? The teacher who requires his students to translate from the second language into English is cheating them of the experience they most desire: to comprehend in the foreign tongue. We complain because the student cannot understand what he hears or what he reads. Yet by insisting that he translate we make it impossible for him to do the very thing we ask him to do. We present him with the equivalent of a foreign language film with English titles, and push him farther and farther into the crosstides of confusion. The by-products of such translations--how well we know them--are these: a more or less distorted notion of what the author originally said; a clear conviction that the second language is but a mirror of English, often clouded and cracked; a statement in written or spoken English so far below the student's normal level of expression that it is often meaningless.

But if I don't have my students translate into English what they hear and read, how can I be sure they have grasped every meaning? Do they grasp the meaning of everything that they hear and read in English? What meaning does a little girl of ten read into her own words when she says: "I was born on the first of July"? What meaning will she read into the same words years later when she herself has had a child? We are confounding the problems of semantics, the most elusive area of language study, with the problems of phonology, structure, idiom, and usage, which are far more tractable than the problems of meaning. Translation belongs in the graduate school. It is an excellent exercise for teachers. It will do the youthful learner little good and much harm for a long, long time.

And grammar! We have probably sinned more grievously in this area than in any other. We have taken a set of rules prescribing the niceties of writing and with them tried to teach all the elements of a new and different linguistic code. We have forgotten--if we ever knew--that the role of grammar is not the same in the mother tongue as it is in the second language. In the former, grammar merely prunes the tree already in full vigor, but in the latter, grammar has the enormous and responsible task of identifying and modeling all the crucial variants in the new language. At every point, we have compared one language with the other, constantly referring to a common underlying grammar. There is no universal grammar any more than there is a universal diet. Our first task in second language grammar is to teach what every six-year-old speaker of that language already knows. And if rules may help the older learner, they cannot be the rules for formal writing.

It is no wonder that in the traditional "grammar" class, language learning comes to a halt and precious hours are spent pondering over rules that for the student are literally meaningless, presented as they usually are in words that are clear only to those who already know. We must stop writing prescriptive grammars for each other and write descriptive grammars for our students. These must be in terms of what is meaningful within the language being studied and what is meaningful to the youthful learner.

Fortunately some steps in this direction are now being taken. We can hope for much from the present studies of the teaching of English as a second language. Already a slender work called le Français élementaire published by a corps of specialists at the Ecole Normale Supérieure at St. Cloud begins the outline of what may be done in French.

And what about word-lists, lexicography, and paradigms? While it is true that anyone who is competent in a second language can give English equivalents for words in that language, the notion that the knowledge of these word-equivalents automatically produces competence in the second language is sheer folly. Words alone are nothing; they acquire meaning only when they are used in a matrix of speech or writing. Above all, no word ever "means" another word. Our students should deal with words as they appear in meaningful sentences, related to situations that give the magic of meaning an opportunity to function.

To deal with literature requires first of all a definition. Literature is an art form. What another artist does with pigments or wood or metal or stone, the literary artist does with words. This art form should be offered to our students in proportion to their ability to accept and appreciate it. It is as wrong to give them too much too soon as to give them too little. No language course should be given that does not include some examples of literary art, presented as such. And no language course should have its primary aim obliterated by an over-emphasis upon literature. Our willing horse should not be denied the glory of a noble rider--nor should he be ridden to death.

The baleful influence of the College Entrance Board examinations upon the work in our classrooms does not come from Princeton, New Jersey, but straight from the teachers' heads. Study plans are altered, extra classes are held, grammar and vocabulary are furiously taught in every type of school, all in the name of "preparing for the College Boards". This deplorable waste could cease overnight if teachers would do what the Board itself recommends and what some schools now do: ignore preparation for the Board exams completely and teach as if they did not exist. The effect of testing upon teaching is inevitable. It can be made wholly positive. But first a firm and honest stand must be taken as to which will do the wagging, the tail or the dog.

And this is not all. We have continued to speak of _language_ and _culture_ as if they were separable and distinct. This may be true if we mean by culture "personal refinement". This may be true if we mean by culture the relics of exceptional work in the arts or crafts. But if we mean by culture the sum total of the learned and shared behavior of a multitude of human beings living together, then language is not only an integral part of every culture, it is the most central and most significant ingredient of every human society, without which society would relapse into a mere aggregation of animals. We must stop our shilly-shallying about this word culture and state clearly what we mean when we say it. We must trace the relationship of the individual's speech to the language of the group, and we must trace the relationship of language, literature, and culture to each other. These words are central in all our professional tasks, and we, of all people, should understand each other when we use them.

But in the past languages have been learned, and well, by great numbers of students. Why change the time-tested methods we have used for so long? To such protests I answer: remember the spectacle of Sir Joseph Lister pleading with the British surgeons to wash their hands and boil their instruments. Humanity did not die because the doctors had failed to observe the practices suggested by Lister, yet the adoption of the techniques he recommended, which were neither mysterious nor difficult, resulted in a dramatic decrease in postoperative fatality.

I should not make all these accusations if I had not been as guilty as anyone else. And I would not make them if I did not have a positive program of corrective measures to recommend. Standing in back of every language teacher who sprinkles the air with the dry dust of pedantry, who makes a puzzle of the norms of speech, who is satisfied when a student makes five trials with four errors and one success, who assigns busy work that ends in nothing but wrong learning, who is a constant referee in linguistic struggles that produce nothing but tortured English, I see that same teacher's better self who recognizes that all this is wasteful nonsense, that the way to learn a language is first to speak it, and the way to appreciate a literature is first to learn a great deal about the language and the culture in which that literature has its roots.

What is chiefly lacking in our classes is not the student's willingness to learn, nor the teacher's competence in the language he teaches, but rather the teacher's insight into what he is supposed to do. Willingness to learn is hard for the teacher to create and competence is long in the getting, but insights can be gained in an instant by that rare thing, an open mind.

The program I recommend for our language classes contains both don'ts and do's. There must be no more translation from the second language into English.

There must be no more wrestling with isolated sentences that do nothing but illustrate a grammatical principle. The *book* must no longer masquerade as the be-all and the end-all of the language course. There must be no more long soliloquies by the teacher, at the end of which one student says: *oui*. We must no longer teach a contemporary language as if the culture that gives it life were dead. We must stop grooming our students specifically for College Board examinations. We must stop speaking *about* the language we teach and *speak the language*. We must become aware of the area of difference between learning the mother tongue and learning a second language. We must disentangle the functions of ear and eye in language learning and *train the ear first*. The steps our language student should take are these, and in this order: hear only authentic foreign speech, speak only what has been heard, read only what has been spoken, write only what has been read, analyze only what has been heard, spoken, read, written, and learned.

Every language teacher should point the finger of inquiry at himself and ask: Is the English spoken by me and my pupils reduced to not more than ten percent of class time? In every course and in every class, do my students spend at least a part of their time hearing and speaking the second language *without seeing printed words*? Do my students talk as much as I do? Are the subjects I discuss with them related to their interests and abilities? Do I provide an adequate spoken *model* for the living speech I want them to learn? Do I provide prompt and adequate *reward* for their right responses to the tasks I set? If the answer to any of these questions is in the negative, changes are in order.

What I am pleading for requires neither time nor money. No foundation grant is going to make us honest with ourselves and give us the courage of our convictions. No lengthy training courses are needed for us to sweep the cobwebs out of our heads. The changes I plead for can be accomplished here in this room, today.

INSTRUCTION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGES: THE STATE OF THE ART*

by

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

The focal point of this discussion is not a South Sea island where a little known language may be analyzed and described. It is not an archaeological ruin where the precious relics of a former language may be pieced together and made meaningful. Nor is it a psychological laboratory where the ingredients of learning are singled out and measured and weighed with precision and care. It is not a writing desk or a printing house where learning materials are prepared and set forth, nor is it a meeting of a committee or a conference - such as this one - where the grand strategy of organized learning is developed and perfected.

Yet closely related to all these is the focal point in question: teacher-learner interaction during the time that instruction in a foreign language is actually taking place. The disciplines referred to - descriptive linguistics, cultural anthropology, psychology - have all contributed many valuable insights to our knowledge of what a language is and how it is learned. Professional initiative and broad public interest and support have centered attention on the importance of our subject. At the focal point we have chosen, all that is meant by language, by a foreign language, and by instruction is, directly or indirectly, involved. We are concerned with an interaction that results in learning, and in this instance in the learning of another language. During this interaction, the cerebral cortex of the learner undergoes certain changes that bring the nerve cells to a higher state of integration than before. Unless this happens, we can hardly say that instruction has been worth the effort.

---

*A talk delivered in April 1963.

Our concern in this discussion is less about the promising results of fresh experimentation and research, however appealing they may be, and more about the actual state of affairs and the tendencies that are to be observed in the total field. The locus of formal learning is for the most part the classroom with, typically, one or several adolescents looking one way and facing an adult, the teacher, who faces them. The advances made during this confrontation, if any, depend upon what each individual brings to the situation in terms of attitude, preparation, previous learning, inner drive, and positive expectancy. They depend also upon the orientation of this cooperative effort, the behavior patterns that are gone through while the session lasts, and the materials and techniques that are employed.

No one who observes a class in the learning of a foreign language can fail to be impressed by the fact that the roots of this activity are many and far-reaching. Where and how did the teacher develop the skills he is called upon to display in the practice of his art? Who identified the objectives and charted the course along which classroom activities are to proceed, and in what way are these made manifest? What does the learner already know that may either help or hinder his success in learning? How receptive is his mind to the new imprinting that it must absorb and retain if the presence of new learning is later to be detected? What are the instruments that will later be used to measure his progress from nowhere to somewhere and from somewhere to somewhere else? By whom were these instruments designed and perfected, and what is their effect upon the learning process? What immediate and long-term outcomes, of which the learner may or may not be aware, seem assured as a result of what takes place? Above all, what is the value of the linguistic processes and products upon which instruction fixes attention while the session lasts?

Are we referring here to ancient languages as well as modern? Yes. Although the acceptance of a revised pedagogy has not been so general in, say, the field of Latin as in that of Spanish, the underlying principles have been worked out for both and they are surprisingly similar. We shall speak for the most part about contemporary languages, for it is here that both the need and the change are most apparent. But nearly all that is said about modern language learning is also true of classical languages, the principal difference being that there are today no native speakers of the latter. Linguistic change has therefore stopped, and communication with a native speaker of a classical language is no longer possible.

There is at present wide professional agreement on the objectives of language study. Perhaps the most significant area of consensus is that we now study a language as communication and for communication, remembering that communication in the narrowest sense is at the level of small talk, but in its wider meaning refers to what is central in all human relationships and is a major concern in science, in literature, and in fine art. We have become much more keenly aware of language as a symbolic transformation, as individual and dual behavior, as a system of sounds and meaningful sound clusters that fit together in a great variety of sentence patterns, as an important element in personality, and as raw material for the fine art of literature. We now perceive more clearly than before that language is not only something we see but also something we say. There is even wide agreement that the saying comes before the seeing, and that this fact should be appropriately reflected in the learning process.

Language occurs in three different states: internalized, air-borne, and pictured or printed on paper. Having for centuries been considered essentially in its pictured state, language has now been analyzed with remarkable depth and clarity in its air-borne form. This has also resulted in many revisions of our understanding of its pictured state. We are now embarking upon a scientific exploration of its internalized state, though knowing well the limitations of science as we go from the reality of overt speech to the unreality of thought. Language in action proceeds in two parallel and related streams, one of code and one of meaning. The learner of a new language must learn not only a new code but a new pattern of meaning to accompany that code, that is, meaning as it relates to the culture whose language he is learning. Except when language is talking about itself (that is, most of the time, outside of classrooms) words do not mean words--they mean non-words. This fact has given a new breadth to the connotation of "culture" and has added a new and challenging task to the activities of the language teacher.

The distinction between the two streams, code and meaning, has a special significance with regard to pictures. As far as the learning of code is concerned, pictures, moving or still, appear to be of little use, if any. In the area of meaning (which seems to involve a different kind of learning) pictures can be of unquestioned value.

We now understand better than we did the nature of the skills we teach. We perceive that two of the skills, listening and reading, are receptive, while the other two, speaking and writing, are productive. As we do so, we note that the learner's control over these skills is of necessity similar to what it is in the mother tongue: that he will understand vastly more than he will ever say, and will be able to read vastly more than he will ever write. Pairing the skills in another way, listening with speaking, and reading with writing, we perceive an equally important distinction, one for which we have coined a new term. We refer to the first two, listening and speaking, as "audiolingual." The second two we call visual-graphic.

Language in its audiolingual form is what all languages were before the invention of writing, all that language is for every child until he learns to write, and what language is in greater part for everyone the world over. To speak of "audiolingual method" is of course naïve for it shows a lack of understanding of both words. If audiolingual were a method, it would lead to little more than illiteracy, which is hardly our goal.

We are in a state of transition, transition from a classroom aimed at one skill--reading--to be developed in a two-year course, with grammar learned through rules and examples, vocabulary through bilingual word lists, with English available to both teacher and learner at all times and with reference at all times to language as it appears in books, in notebooks, and on blackboards. And all this without benefit of any face-to-face communication in the language being learned. We are in transition toward a classroom in which all four skills are learned, with appropriate sequence and emphasis, in a course lasting from four to six years or longer. Analogy is put to work along with analysis in the learning of structure. Vocabulary is learned in the context of whole utterances in the foreign language and English is made use of not for communication but only to establish meaning (and for certain other pedagogical purposes). Comprehension is developed in the foreign language without the intervention of English. Rather than being a workshop for the comparative analysis of two language codes, the classroom is becoming a cultural island in which the new language is used as it is used in the foreign country, as a medium of communication in normal interpersonal relationships, in the details of everyday life, in the study of the new culture, and in an acquaintance with and an appreciation for its literature.

We are tending toward a much more detailed and carefully programmed course of study. In order that what is now termed "programmed learning" may be effective, goals must become and remain clear, the most direct route to these goals must be marked out and followed, the learner's advance must be by minimal steps, error must be overcome by avoiding it, efficiency of progress must be heightened by immediate and constant reinforcement of the learning desired. The proponents of programmed learning have reminded us of some basic facts about our work in the field of languages, and we needed these reminders. They have said: remember, we don't learn by making mistakes, we learn by giving the right response. Decide what you want the learner eventually to know, then start at the beginning point and guide him to that destination by minimal steps, helping him to diminish error by simply avoiding it and by telling him quickly when he is right. Make repetition and re-entry of what he has already learned a constant practice. Take as your two key words: model and reinforcement.

The recommendations of programmed learning are efficient, time-saving, and humane. But in our subject matter, programmers have yet to discover how to help the learner find and correct his own mistakes in the sound system. And apparently they have yet to discover that language is something that takes place between two people, related in a single behavior pattern, and that, for the young, the machine is a poor substitute for a linguistic partner. Programmed learning is, in essence, a refined and enlightened application of what formal education has always striven for: a systematic ordering of what is to be learned, and a presentation of these matters in a learnable way. Now that goals are far more precisely defined than before, now that additional skills are to be learned, now that much more is known about the learning process, programmed learning may expect to become a most valuable asset in language learning--without, of course, presuming to have invented it.

Some tendencies toward fully programmed learning are already visible. In the new perspective, the teacher provides models in the foreign language for all skills the student is to learn (especially speaking and writing) and engages in direct exchange of communication with class and individual. His own personal modeling is often supplemented by recordings on tape or disc which are used by the student in the classroom, or in the language laboratory, or at home. This modeling becomes an integral part not only of beginning levels but of more advanced levels as well. The single book has been separated into segments for initial learning, with certain parts that, for a time, the student hears and speaks but does not see, sections for special training in reading and writing, for class work, for laboratory work, for structure drills, for sustained reading, and for tests. Of course these various segments are summarized in manuals for the teacher and accompanied by generous directions concerning techniques of presentation, correction, reinforcement, and interaction. We now envisage separate texts for the learning of language competence, for cultural studies, and for literary readings.

In the learning of grammar, much more reliance is now placed upon analogy and less upon analysis in the methods and materials used. In order to become familiar with a structural pattern, the student first learns a sequence of sentences or utterances constructed on a single plan, and only then extracts from them the single formula on which all were built. Again, he learns a sequence of sentences that present a consistent pattern of minimal changes, then extracts a rule that summarizes these typical changes. By so doing, he makes use not only of generalizations that help him perceive "how the language works" but also of hidden sameness, a factor that was so ever-present and so forceful in the learning of the mother tongue. The establishment of a word pile or lexical pool is minimized until the student has control of the sound system and the sentence patterns that are frequent in the spoken exchange of language. But then the expansion of vocabulary becomes a prime objective. It has reached essentially by dealing with words and phrases in the context in which they occur and by making all reasonable use of the foreign language in establishing new meanings. Of course English is referred to when necessary and when such reference does not detract from the skills already established.

We have ceased to think only of the grade in which the student is but to think rather of the level of advancement in the subject matter at which he is. For this reason we have given the word Level this practical definition: the amount of work that is normally done in the high school in a class that meets five times a week. In the junior high, a level may last for two years and in the elementary school for three or four. In college, a level may be accomplished in a semester. We may consider that Levels I and II constitute the basic course, no matter when the learner starts. Levels III and IV are intermediate and advanced work, and are sufficient for the needs of a language requirement. Levels V and VI embrace the equivalent of what is now called the Advanced Placement Program, in which the student is given a balanced experience in language competence, in cultural insight, and in literary acquaintance and appreciation.

The recognition of new objectives is already bringing about many changes in what is expected of the teacher in the classroom and in the nature of the materials prepared for his use. The U.S. Government, through the NDEA, has since 1959 been supporting an Institute program for the training and retraining--on college and University campuses--of secondary and elementary school teachers of modern languages. It has likewise supported the development of new materials for teaching languages in the secondary schools and for testing the language ability of both teachers and students. These efforts have not been without effect. At the present time, both the College Entrance Examination Board and the Cooperative Testing Division of the Educational Testing Service are conducting national surveys of what is happening in language classes. Both are asking teachers one essential question: Is the approach used in your classes to be defined as traditional or as audiolingual? There is already ample evidence that as of now both approaches are widely popular.

Certain technological developments are helping us in our transition. Since paper and printer's ink can't talk, it has become necessary to devise new kinds of materials for new kinds of learning. The so-called language laboratory has become the audiolingual book. A tape recorder can present an excellent model, sounded through earphones within less than an inch of the learner's ear. It can repeat the model with exactness in every detail, and do so endlessly. The patience of the machine is almost inexhaustible.

A language laboratory is a room so equipped that a number of students--a class or even several classes--can work with recordings at the same time. Such language laboratories are now to be found everywhere. There are hundreds of them on college campuses and thousands of them in secondary schools. In itself, the language laboratory provides no guarantee whatever that language learning will improve. Yet when used by a skillful teacher, with laboratory work and classroom work fully integrated, a marked improvement in speed and quality of learning usually results. Contrary to what has been thought in the past, the value of the laboratory appears to lie much less in the opportunity for the learner to compare his recorded voice with that of the model and much more in simple, frequent imitations of the model. The mechanisms in the laboratory can supplement and relieve the teacher's voice and can provide more frequent repetitions for those learners who require them. The laboratory has become very important in testing the audiolingual skills. In general, it can be said that the value of the laboratory is less in terms of whether the installation is simple or complicated and more in terms of whether the teacher relates laboratory work directly with classroom work and makes it an integral part of his course.

Materials, methods, and measurement are closely interrelated and interdependent. Modification and development in any one involves complementary changes in the others. Tests and measurements are keeping pace with the changes in objectives and classroom procedures, as we can see in the newly developed batteries of tests in all the language skills. Thanks to research work done by the CEEB and by ETS in recent years and to the generous aid of the U.S. Government in the form of NDEA funds, we now have reliable ways of measuring the productive as well as the receptive skills on the part of both teachers and students. A learner constantly needs a reliable estimate of his own progress. Administration officials need an accurate index of advances made through the proposed curriculum. Only tests, carefully made and sufficiently varied, can respond adequately to these requirements. In our transition period, many innovations in curriculum content and learning techniques are being proposed and tried out. Evaluation of these new departures also requires measurement, especially in terms of broadly based norms. Only standardized tests can yield this indispensable information.

A most welcome by-product of standardized tests is a growing awareness by teachers of more and better ways of preparing homemade tests. And as progress tests improve and become more numerous, we perceive with satisfaction the reinforcement to learning that results from a testing program that is skillfully interwoven with the learning sequence.

It is now appropriate for us to pose a salient question that we have seldom asked in the past: Is our language learner a monolingual, knowing only a mother tongue, or is he, due to experiences in or outside of formal education, already accustomed to communicating in more than one language? As a learner, the latter differs very much from the former, as much as the musician who already plays an instrument and begins another differs from the non-musician who is just at the threshold of his musical career. A mandate of extreme importance seems implied in our transition process: the breaking of the monolingual shell is a school task, to be accomplished, for important psychological reasons, in the elementary or the secondary school, and in terms of the circumstances of formal education that there obtain. Although this is now often postponed until the student reaches college, it is not truly a college assignment nor can it be rightly understood and accomplished in terms of the college world.

The Advanced Placement Program, now beginning to be widely followed in the last year of the secondary school, is a clear reflection of the kind of preparation the colleges would prefer to have the undergraduate bring to his freshman year. Colleges may for some time yet be willing to add new languages after a second language has already been established. But the college is uneasy and often inept in dealing with the monolingual student. The sooner the schools assume full responsibility for drawing the learner out of his monolingual shell and for establishing the beginnings of bilingualism, the better for all concerned. There is every indication that this can be done in the language classroom, and that it is being done far more widely today than ever before. If all our programs could be, or would even strive to be, as good as the best that we can now identify over and over again, we could indeed consider language learning to be in very good estate.

WHAT IS LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY?*

by

Nelson Brooks

Yale University

The topic I am to discuss has been given the form of a question: What is foreign language proficiency? Modern foreign languages attained status in the curricula of schools and colleges in the United States not long after our Civil War. You may well wonder why, nearly a century later, we find ourselves still asking such a central and crucial question as this.

But there are good and sufficient reasons why, even though it may have been answered adequately before, this question needs to be asked again. The program of language learning in formal education in which we are now engaged is far more comprehensive and ambitious than any in the past, and we are well advised to redefine proficiency in the light of present circumstances.

For my part, I have for some time been attracted by the word proficiency as it relates to foreign language learning, and I have considered it along with three other words: prognosis, progress, and achievement. We may distinguish between these by saying that prognosis might tell us how well the learner may succeed before he even begins, progress will follow him closely through the steps or stages or levels that mark his advance from the start. Achievement would refer to total blocks of learning, and would be significant only after a considerable amount of work had been done. Finally, proficiency, which looks beyond the learning process itself, considers the net accomplishment when formal training is over.

---

*A talk given at New York University, November 14, 1964.

Proficiency is an excellent point on which to focus our attention, and if we pause to considersome of the preliminary steps and phases leading to it, please remember that it is the desired final outcome that we have constantly in mind. The word language also merits a comment as to its precise reference in our question. Following Ferdinand de Saussure and other analysts of language, we may see the stream of speech flowing in two parallel channels, one of code and one of meaning--or, if you like, one of expression and one of content. It might be possible to consider language proficiency merely in terms of code or expression, with little or no regard for meaning or content. To do this, however, would result in our having the shell without the walnut, or the box without the chocolates. I have chosen to consider our question with full concern for what is said as well as how it is said.

Those of us who were language teachers between the two world wars well remember the professional consensus that agreed upon a single objective: Reading. We can also recall both our hopes and our misgivings, during the late forties and early fifties, as the single objective became a triple objective--language competence, cultural insight, and literary acquaintance--with language competence referring not only to one skill, reading, but to four skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing.

Since the year 1958 when the NDEA came into being, we who teach modern foreign languages have been very much in the limelight. There has been both professional and public confidence in our being able to accomplish what we proposed to do, and there has been a generous supply of Government funds to aid us in our work. In simplest terms, we have set out to teach our students to do with the language they are learning--the target language--what is done with it by those whose native language it is.

Now to learn to use a language as it is used by a native speaker is one thing, but to become a native speaker is quite another. High hopes must be tempered with realism. The language in which we grow up from infancy through childhood to adulthood is very much a part of ourselves, our personality, our inmost thoughts. Our mother tongue fits us like our skin, or our right arm. At best, a second language learned in formal education can fit us only like a new suit of clothes. But the cloth can be of good quality, it can be tailored to fit us well, we can wear it gracefully and with general approval, and we can keep it pressed and in good condition. The second language learner thus becomes linguistically presentable and respectable.

During the past decade a number of quite powerful new concepts concerning second language learning have been spelled out and widely discussed. It is necessary to refer briefly to a few of them in order to understand what is involved in the proficiency which is our concern. One of these concepts is that of language as communication. By communication we mean not only face-to-face communication between speakers but also writer-to-reader communication in written and printed forms and artist-to-audience communication in the field of literature. Implied in this concept is the notion that we are to learn to do with a foreign language what the native speakers of that language do with it. This in turn implies two other important matters: one, the use of a single language code without reference to any other; and two, concentration on the message or the content of what is being said rather than upon the manner of the saying.

Another important concept is that of the levels of language learning. This may be very briefly summarized as follows: A level comprises the amount of work that can successfully be accomplished in a single year in the upper grades of a secondary school, in which all the prime needs of time, materials, facilities, staff, and able students are adequately met, as we now find they are, over and over again, in public and independent schools in all parts of the country. Projected upward in the academic scale, a level may represent the work of a single semester in college, provided classes meet five times a week. Projected downward to the junior high or the elementary school, a level may well fill the space of two years or more. In view of circumstances as we find them, we may say that there are six levels in all, the first two comprising the Basic Course, the next two comprising the Language Requirement, and the last two the Literature Requirement. In its upper third, this levels concept corresponds well with the Advanced Placement Program now familiar to all. An important implication of the levels concept is that Level I of the Basic Course may be begun in the seventh grade in the junior high, or it may be begun in the ninth grade. It may also be begun, as indeed it often is, in grade thirteen, the freshman year in college. And of course we now have many students who begin Level I in the third or fourth grade in the elementary school.

If we recognize that the code side of language, that is pronunciation, forms, and word order, is the same for everyone--in English, for example, the past tense, "have" and "haven't", and the apostrophe s are popular with all ages--we can say that the linguistic factor in the Basic Course is the same for all. Differences will come in the vocabulary or meaning factor in language, and we must of course insist that materials respect the age and psychological development of the learner in this regard. To return for a moment to the title of our discussion, we shall want to identify proficiency at the end of the sixth level and at the end of the fourth, that is, the Language Requirement. We may also want to identify proficiency at the end of the second level or the Basic Course, although here we have penetrated rather deeply into the area that should be referred to rather under the heading of achievement.

There is a third new concept of great importance that we refer to as the cultural concept, a notion we have discussed and debated, quite earnestly, for at least five years, without making very much progress. A prime stumbling block is the word culture itself, which has so many different meanings for different people. In our perplexity we have sometimes had recourse to the word civilization, but again, not very successfully, for culture and civilization are not at all the same. For what it may be worth, I suggest that we use the terms greater culture and lesser culture, meaning by greater culture the products of artistic endeavor, the achievement of intellectual and inventive genius, and all the various modes of significant thought and genteel living of which a country is fully aware and justly proud, and is quite ready to display and talk about, even to export. By lesser culture, in contrast, we refer to the thoughts and actions, the beliefs and concerns and hopes and worries, the multitudinous and infinitely subtle gradations of interpersonal relationships as expressed in deeds and words, the day by day details of life as it is lived at home and at school, at work and at play, in church and in celebrations, in childhood and in manhood, in country and in city--in a word what it is like to be an Italian or a Japanese, a German or a Peruvian. For the language teacher, both greater and lesser culture are extremely important, but the distinction we are making between the two may make it possible to introduce culture in a more meaningful way in the early levels of language learning. At all events, anyone who teaches in the state of New York and must deal with the Regents Examinations is well aware that the cultural concept, no matter how we may define it and develop it, is something that cannot be brushed aside. If it be asked why we should consider the cultural objective at all in our definition of language proficiency, the answer is very simple: The meaning of language can only be the meaning it has for those who speak the language natively. Not to learn culture is not to learn meaning, and we would be left with only one of the two channels that comprise language. Again, it would be the box without the chocolates, or if you like, the dress without the lady.

All three of these concepts--communication, the levels, and culture--are directly important to the student himself. We should mention also a fourth concept that is of direct concern to the teacher, and of course, indirectly, to the student as well. This we call the multi-discipline concept of language learning and language teaching, and again, in capsule form, we will attempt to describe it. According to this concept, language teaching is a discipline in its own right. It occupies a mid-position with regard to a number of related fields and the pattern of this relationship is as follows: In the full exercise of his professional tasks, the language teacher refers for information, for basic principles, and for new insights to three humanistic fields, namely philosophy, philology, and literature. At the same time, and for the same purposes, he refers to three fields of science, psychology, descriptive linguistics, and cultural anthropology. Needless to say, he must frequently refer also to pedagogy and technology. We do not have time this morning to review all these fields and set up inventories of what the language teacher may expect to find in them that will be germane to his classroom problems. To do this adequately under any circumstances might seem like too overwhelming an assignment, and it may well be asked whether the foreign language teacher is expected to have a basic preparation in all these fields that is comparable to what is expected of a specialist in each of them. The answer of course is: By no means. But the language teacher can be and should be aware of what is to be discovered in each of these fields that is significant to him. And when we talk about meaning, or about grammar and a text, or about literary interpretation on the one hand, or about learning theory and mental measurements, about phonemic inventories, or about the portmanteau word culture, on the other, we should be aware of what is known and what is being learned under these headings in these various disciplines. There is no doubt that the total profile of proficiency on the part of the language teacher must eventually take all these areas into account.

So far we have been examining the broad perspectives within which proficiency for student and teacher may be described. It is time now to state in specific terms what their proficiencies should be. It is, as I am sure you will agree, no longer appropriate to describe language learning proficiency in terms of where the learner has sat, and for how long, what books he may have had open before him, and to whom he may have listened, attentively or otherwise. Since language is something we do, and is wholly learned, proficiency, for our purposes, must now be stated in terms of how the student performs in all four skills in the language he has been studying, with what penetration he perceives matters of cultural interest and importance, and the extent and quality of his acquaintance with literature in the language being studied.

There are documents in print that outline with precision and detail what is expected by way of performance of the student as he reaches certain points in the levels we have referred to and of the teacher as he directs affairs in the language classroom. Student proficiency is outlined in a bulletin issued a year ago by the State Department of Education in California, entitled Language Instruction, Perspective and Prospectus, and in the so-named "Acorn" books issued by the Advanced Placement Program. Teacher proficiency is outlined in a document entitled "Qualifications for Secondary School Teachers of MFL's" which first appeared in PMLA in 1955. The content of these documents has received long and careful scrutiny by many persons and organizations and may be said to present a professional consensus. Their content is for the most part now reflected in nationally based standardized tests for both students and teachers.

Time does not permit a lengthy review of these statements, and we shall have to be content with a close look at certain arbitrarily chosen points. For the student, let us state first the proficiency we would like him to have at the end of Level IV, that is, when he has completed his Language Requirement.

Since the assignment given me by our conference Chairman was, and I quote, "To project what, ideally, we need", I will describe our ideal student as if I had just been observing him. I heard him talking easily, idiomatically, and well with a native speaker, in the target language, on books he had read, on travels he had made, on plays he had seen in the theater, and on the works of a contemporary painter in whom he was especially interested. My ideal student is just beginning the twelfth grade in high school and started his language course in school five years ago. His control of language has been acquired in the classroom and in the language laboratory, without benefit of home experience or travel in another country. He has read hundreds of pages of prose, much of it of literary quality, and some poetry. I saw a copy of a letter he had written to a pen pal in the foreign country and glanced over a five-page essay he had written in the target language discussing the author's portrayal of character in a novel he had recently studied. I heard his present teacher say that he had never spoken to the student in English, either in class or out. I chatted with the student myself, in the target language, and I was immediately impressed by the correctness and naturalness as well as the ease with which he spoke, by the pride he displayed in being able to do this, and by his eagerness to continue what he had begun when he reached college the following year. Now, lest you think I am making all this up out of whole cloth, I must tell you that many of the details in this recital actually took place in the State of Indiana only a few weeks ago. If you like, you may write to Mr. Leonard Brisley of the Indianapolis Public Schools for confirmation.

If we do decide to talk about proficiency at the end of the second level, that is, at the end of the Basic Course, how shall we describe it, still "ideally"? At this point our learner has complete and accurate control of the sound system, both individual vowel and consonant sounds and intonation patterns. He has a recognition knowledge of all the basic syntactic patterns of spoken language and can use most of them. He can comprehend, by listening and also by writing, subject matter that is comparable in content and difficulty to what he has learned. He can write all that he can say. He has firsthand knowledge of brief samples of cultural and of contemporary literary prose, and he can converse in simple terms about them. His knowledge of vocabulary is limited, as we would expect it to be. His ability to translate is nearly non-existent, and we are glad that it is, for there is every indication that translating, if it is word by word and phrase by phrase, encourages interference between two languages and tends to destroy the native-speaker control of the target language that our learner has been working so hard to establish.

The point I have arbitrarily chosen for the description of proficiency on the part of the teacher is at the end of the first year of teaching. This teacher's control of the language skills is such that she can give adequate modelling, coaching, and training to the twelfth grader just described. Referring to the six disciplines mentioned a few moments ago, we find that this teacher has been helped most of all by her studies in literature, in which she majored when an undergraduate in college. She has also been greatly helped by the concepts of applied linguistics, which have deepened her understanding of what language is and how it works, and made her aware of the contrastive differences in sound and structure between the mother tongue of her students and the language they are studying. Our teacher is far too wise to be taken in by the naive notion that a language is its vocabulary, an idea deeply rooted in traditional attitudes, and not in the lay mind alone. She knows that we owe to the American linguists the valuable insights that language is something you say before it is something you see and that the patterns of sound and order and form lie far deeper in language than does its vocabulary.

Our teacher has been helped a little by notions gleaned in philosophy, that is, by considering language as symbolic transformation and by analyzing the nature of meaning in words and utterances. She has been helped a little by philology, especially with regard to the history of language and with regard to language as a text. She has been helped even more by the concept of culture proposed by the cultural anthropologists. She is aware that many references in a literary text that might be taken for granted are worthy of special comment. She has noted, as an example, that in André Gide's Return of the Prodigal Son there is a conversation between two person in which one of them consistently uses 'tu' and the other 'vous' (that is, familiar and formal address). There is also a reference to a bride chosen by the parents for the son (who willingly accepts), to children reading too much, and to the suspicion often felt for those who are not 'du pays', that is, are not local people--and all this in a single page. The teacher knows that students are interested in exploring such details of lesser culture, for these are, in the long run, very revealing as to what life in the target culture is like.

Ironically, she has been helped least of all by psychology; although to a surprising extent, her daily problems are psychological. Her work in educational psychology never touched upon the learning of a second language in an American classroom, but in her year of teaching she has found it necessary to become the amateur psychologist that every teacher must inevitably be. This lacuna in her proficiency is not her fault, nor indeed the fault of anyone. I mention it because it is an area in which professional steps need to be taken with all appropriate speed.

To summarize, I have tried to establish for you the framework within which proficiency in language learning should now be described, both for learner and for teacher. We have seen the learner at the end of a four-level course that has brought him to what we call the Language Requirement. We have also observed, very briefly, the competence he has at the end of his Basic Course, half way, at least, toward the Language Requirement. We have seen the teacher prepared to teach such learners by virtue of new concepts of language learning, new curricula and new courses, and new standards of professional competence and responsibility. If I have spoken to a certain extent ideally, I have also tried to be very practical. This I believe we are entitled to do, for language teachers are now in the enviable position of seeing their ideals become reality.

SCHOOL-COLLEGE COLLABORATION AND THE F L LEARNER *

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

Teachers of foreign languages in schools and in colleges need to explore ways in which a better relationship may be set up between these two areas of instruction. A start may be made by listing some of the characteristics that each area possesses.

A few familiar terms will remind us of what life is like at the secondary school level. Teachers in schools live in a world that is what it is because of I Q's, college entrance examinations, lesson plans, and band practice; attendance records, principals, guidance counseling, and lunch hours; PTA's, Boards of Education, report cards, and discipline; the Red Cross, home rooms, tenure, and school spirit.

The college teacher lives in a world of seminars, warning grades, professional journals, and bibliography; section meetings, publication, advanced degrees, and orals; professorships, research, dean's lists, and faculty meetings; lecture notes, departmental majors, bluebooks, and dissertations.

To point up the contrast in another way, language programs as they are carried out in schools tend to show a pattern of collaboration and team work that is quite different from the spirit of individualism that animates the members of a college faculty. This is not surprising, for after all, scholarly work in our field is for the most part individual work. Ph.D. degrees are seldom given to a team, such as Fraser and Squair. They are given rather, to the individual who has demonstrated how competent and resourceful he is when working on his own.

For the most part, the teacher in the secondary school concentrates upon developing the intellect, the character, and the personality of the students in his classes, and upon preparing them for college and for life in the adult world. Such a teacher has

---

*A talk given at Cold Spring Harbor, New York, March 31, 1965.

his own professional growth and development to think of also, but I believe it is fair to say that the major effort he puts forth is focused, directly or indirectly, upon learning and the learner.

For the college teacher, things fall into a different pattern. He is concerned not only about the students in his classes, he is under obligation to be constantly active in the world of scholarship in order to maintain his position and to improve it. He must earn a doctor's degree and he must publish, both articles and books, in his chosen field. However enthusiastic and successful a college instructor may be with regard to classroom teaching, he soon discovers that this is but a part of what he will receive credit for professionally, and that there are other and quite different activities he must engage in if he is to prosper in his career.

To consider the learner for a moment, what varieties of experience are there for him as he sits through the long sequence of classroom hours, first in school and then in college? In answer we may review what the student's activities are as he begins his course and continues with it. There seems to be a consensus now that the successive stages of instruction through which the learner goes can be marked off into three distinct phases, each containing two levels (a level being approximately the work of a single year in the senior high school, the same work requiring more time if done earlier and somewhat less time if done in college.) At the end of the first phase we may say that the learner has completed a basic course. The second phase, levels three and four, bring him to a recognized degree of language competence. The third phase, levels five and six, should provide him with a measurable degree of competence, even though only introductory, in literary studies. Naturally, the character of the work he does will vary greatly from one phase to the next.

In the basic course he will be mainly occupied in gaining competence in the four language skills and control over the structure of the language, especially in its spoken form, using the minimum vocabulary necessary for these objectives. The emphasis changes sharply, however, in phase two. Without any less concern for the skills and for structure, he must now apply himself to the acquisition of vocabulary and idiom, and have an extended experience in reading, accompanied by the best possible training in writing. He may then go on to phase three, engaging in work that keeps alive all his control of language, but that now finds time for an extended experience in cultural and literary studies.

A very desirable plan would be for as many students as possible to complete phase two, the language requirement, at the time they complete the twelfth grade. Colleges are both willing and well prepared to accept the learner at this point, and to provide for him an agreeable and profitable continuation in what we have referred to as levels five and six. What college faculties want to do, seemingly, to the last man (or woman), is to teach literature. But they can teach it only to those students who have gained the necessary command of all the language skills and who know what reading and writing mean in terms of literary study.

Now the fact is that for a large number of students this desirable scheme does not fall neatly into place. Many of them come to college with only a basic course to their credit, and even then many are lacking in one or more of the basic skills. Or they come with a reasonably good basic course but without the knowledge of vocabulary and the extensive reading experience that would bring them to a point of recognized language competence.

Confusing and frustrating is the predicament of the college instructor who faces a class of, say, twenty students each of whom has had a different pattern of preparation for the language requirement. The training in teaching which the instructor has had (if indeed he has had any) has usually not prepared him for this dismaying prospect. As a result, many a time, not because he wishes to but because he does not know what else to do, he talks to the class in English, he asks the students to translate, and he does his best to teach them a little grammar--which they never know in the way he does. Whether or not this is what the students wish to do, or whether any of them can do far more than this, is lost in the dissolving fact that this is the one program all can engage in.

It is legitimate to ask why all twenty of these students have been admitted to Course 101, and yet have had such a widely different preparation. One thing is crystal clear: it is not the fault of the students. We may place the blame on the placement examination, on the entrance examination, on the materials the student has been studying from, on the teachers under whose direction he has worked, on adminstration and guidance and curriculum planning for not architecting the right course of study, on the parents for insisting that the student take this and not take that--but we should not blame the student himself. Is it his fault if Student A, who has already read several novels and plays and can translate passages from them reasonably well, but who cannot understand a single word that is spoken to him in the foreign language, finds himself sitting beside Student B, who chats quite glibly in French or German but who has not, so far, read a single page of what might be called a literary text and who cannot write a respectable paragraph in the foreign language about anything?

The instructor whose dilemna we are describing operates at one of the most critical points in the sequence of our language programs. It would appear to be a professional responsibility of the first order to dimish this diversity of preparations and, at the same time, to aid the instructor in dealing with the degree of diversity that cannot be eliminated altogether.

To confront the second part of this obligation first, we may as well state a few blunt facts. The competence and good will of the instructor are never in question. But his experience as a teacher tends to be brief, his preparation for teaching even briefer, and the supervision of his work practically nil, not to mention the fact that his interest in his work as a teacher is often diminished or interfered with by his other professional interests, for reasons we have mentioned. He succeeds well with well-prepared students. It is with those whose preparation is inadequate or uneven that he falters, for they are in need of that which he is precisely least well prepared to teach them. It is not too much to say that colleges have a most serious obligation to provide this instructor with the training and supervision necessary to help these students with their deficiencies. Happily, this obligation is slowly being realized. Within very recent years, courses and programs to this effect have been intitated on many campuses, providing for those who give instruction of this sort the support and direction they need.

To confront the first phase of this problem--that is, why the preparation has been so diversified in the schools--is a different matter, but this too is a professional responsibility, having an importance and an urgency quite as great as any that falls upon the colleges. The lack of a reasonable degree of sameness in the student's experience at the school level can no longer be laid to the lack of appropriate recommendations or of appropriate materials or of appropriate tests. Thanks to the professional leadership that has been provided by the Modern Language Association ever since 1952 and thanks to the funds that have been forthcoming from the federal government since 1958, through the NDEA, it is now quite clear what secondary school courses should accomplish, how they can be made to do so, and as well, how we can measure to find out whether they have or not.

There would seem to remain two crucial questions: Can the teacher teach in the desired way? and is he willing to do so? A sustained and quite successful effort is being made to aid the teacher in the matter of language competence and teaching techniques, again with the aid of federal funds, in the Institute Programs with which we are all well acquainted. There is every indication that these will continue and increase in quality, in variety, and in effectiveness. This leaves the final difficult and delicate question concerning the teacher's willingness to teach in the recommended way. It is well known that a pattern of polarity is to be observed in the overall picture of what is happening in language classrooms in our schools and colleges. This polarity is the result of noting what occurs in classrooms with regard to five sensitive points: the use of English, the role of translation, the explaining of grammar, the use of printed texts, and the use of quizzes and tests. According to data gathered by the Educational Testing Service there is a clustering of schools and colleges that follow what we may call the traditional approach on the one hand and the four-skills or audiolingual approach on the other. For the moment, we need not attempt to evaluate either of these, but we are bound to recognize that the opposition exists, and that it has much to do with the variation in preparation which our college instructor faces in September in his division of Course 101.

If we are to integrate the two worlds of school and college language instruction, we can hardly hope to succeed without arranging for an extensive exchange of information about each world, to be provided for and assimilated by the other. Likewise, an exchange of information between those who teach traditionally and those who teach language as communication is necessary. But there is a difference here that I must beg leave to point out. We all know what the traditional approach is, both those who teach in this way and those who do not. The reverse, however, is not true. What is meant by the four-skills approach, what goes on in a so-called audiolingual classroom, is often not known by those who teach traditionally, for the reason that they have not been in such classes long enough to be fully informed. Clearly, if we are to inaugurate a new phase of exchange of information, this is a proper place to begin.

Having identified a number of problems and critical issues, we may go on to suggest some ways in which they may be confronted. As is often the case, it is less a matter of creating new positions, new functions, new organizations, and more a matter of recognizing areas where a potential for improvement already exists, providing ways and means of setting up lines of communication between them, and preparing the plans, the messages, and the findings that can flow back and forth.

On every undergraduate faculty there will be found one person who is responsible for the content and the direction of the various language courses that are offered. This person may be the chairman of the department himself or it may be someone else who is designated to supervise this work. In any case, this person is very conversant with the nature of the different courses and with the preparation that is expected of students who are placed in them and with the quality of the results eventually obtained. Such a person is of course much interested in the competence that students bring from the schools, for this is germane to his problem of assigning students to the level where they can work to best advantage and to the problem of adjusting course content to student preparation: he is no less concerned about the requirements of courses that are to follow.

Those who teach in schools should know that such a coordinator of undergraduate courses exists and that there is a high degree of identity between his interests and theirs. In the schools the principal, the department chairman, or the supervisor on languages has a comparable view of what is in progress at different levels on the part of different teachers and classes. Administration officers and guidance counselors, although they may not actually be teaching language courses, often watch them rather closely and are rightfully concerned about their general character and their success in preparing students for college. It would seem that lists of names, identifying the persons I have described, could be drawn up and kept current. Thus, either school or college could know to whom a request for information could be addressed when the occasion arose.

In addition to individuals, there are widely representative organizations that could well cooperate in attacking pedagogical problems even more actively than they have up to now. As a means whereby professional consideration can be given to such matters by teachers in both schools and colleges working together, I would suggest a wider use of the so-called "working committee" plan, which has been very successfully used in regional conferences since 1952. Most of the national organizations of language teachers hold regularly scheduled meetings once or twice a year. The working committee plan could well be taken as a model or guide for setting up a design whereby specific problems can be identified, persons enlisted to work on them, and reports and recommendations prepared for discussion at regular meetings of the larger groups. Such a scheme calls for no little initiative, organization, and extra work. But happily, in our profession today there are great potentials for these available everywhere, at both school and college levels. The schools have amply demonstrated this in the thousands of participants that have attended NDEA Institutes since 1959. The colleges have demonstrated it also, especially in the corps of past and present Directors of these language institutes and in the numbers of college faculties who have staffed these programs. It goes without saying that we shall not have complete professional agreement on all the matters we discuss, but it is beneath our professional self-respect not to be informed about the nature of these problems and the substance of our colleagues' opinions and recommendations concerning them.

As we look ahead to what the subjects of some of these working committee assignments might be, aiming toward better communication, cooperation, and collaboration between our two worlds, we may list a number of topics and themes that merit sustained attention. One of the first that comes to mind is visits. No single activity could contribute more toward what we are aiming at than a well devised and duly executed program of visits to language classrooms, on the part of college teachers to schools, and of school teachers to colleges, and, as well, a more active program of visits at one's own level. Visits are time-consuming; they require a certain amount of planning, protocol, and polite insistence. But it is amazing how quickly and how radically opinions firmly held can be altered as a result of direct observation of what happens in a classroom. The degree of enlightenment and of encouragement that can come from visits is phenomenal, and they are well worth what they cost.

Another vital topic is the teaching of writing. We who teach foreign languages should not feel too badly if we are forced to admit that we really don't do this very well--our colleagues who teach English don't do it very well either, and this is one of the liveliest issues in their revolution which is just getting under way. There is a book on this subject that can be most valuable to us, as it is to them, in improving results in this direction. The title of this book is How the French Boy Learns to Write, and it was written in 1915 by Rollo W. Brown. Long out of print, it has recently been re-issued by the National Council of Teachers of English. (It is available through the M.L.A.) Everyone who is concerned with teaching students to write in a foreign language should make an intensive study of this book. We may be confident that reports on it and discussions of its many suggestions would greatly benefit language teachers at all levels.

Another important matter is maturity. Many of those who teach in the schools now take their students through a course that not only puts them in very good command of language skills but also provides them with a close acquaintance with a number of literary texts. What guidelines can be suggested for carrying out this more advanced part of the work? To put it another way, what is to be the twelfth grader's experience with a literary text in the foreign language? The answer will be related not only to his command of the language skills and of vocabulary but as well to two other major matters. One of these will be the kind of experience he is currently having in his course in senior English. The other will be the degree of intellectual maturity we can expect him to have. Again, we can foresee the valuable reports, comments, and suggestions that could result from serious school-college committee thinking on this arresting subject. Related to this, to be sure, is the Advanced Placement Program. This merits much discussion, too. But for the moment we are thinking only of what we may call our regular course for seniors in levels five and six.

This is but a brief list that any language teacher could augment with equally significant topics upon which our professional attention could be focused in such joint efforts. We may conclude by affirming once more that the potential for better coordination between schools and colleges in foreign language instruction is clearly in evidence everywhere. Our need is to channel our interests and activities in such a way as to make them fully complementary and mutually effective.

MOTION PICTURES IN TEACHER EDUCATION: Ideas and Applications in Language Instruction

by Nelson Brooks

Yale University

[A talk given at Teachers College, Columbia University, June 14, 1966]

Before we recommend an instrument for use in teacher training, we need to be specific about what the instrument is and what the teachers are being trained for. We need to be precise about what the teacher does in that subject of instruction. As you will have noticed, our topic is very broad, though the subtitle narrows it down to something reasonably within the knowledge of your speaker. For our present purpose, the instrument is the sound motion picture and the teachers in question are being trained for instruction in a modern foreign language--a subject in which the teacher's role is both similar to and different from that of teachers in other areas of the curriculum.

If we are to talk about pictures, we shall have to talk about light. If we are to talk about language, we shall have to talk about sound. And as we talk about pictures and language, we should place them in that whole spectrum of symbolic transformations which includes music, mathematics, and ritual, among others, and of which pictures and language are such important areas. And again, if we are to talk about teachers, we must talk about learning, and about the teacher's all-important role in helping learning to occur.

I propose to treat our topic under six different headings, as follows:

1) Learning and knowing.
2) The five senses.
3) The physics and the psychology of light and sound.
4) The nature of language.
5) The sound motion picture in the foreign language course.
6) The sound motion picture in teacher training.

How do we learn? How do we know what we know? These are ancient, incessant problems and of course we cannot give satisfactory answers. But these questions must be in our minds of we are to do anything at all with our topic. We are constantly learning while we are awake, even though what we learn may be utterly trivial. The daily newspaper is filled--or purports to be--with what we did not know before. Learning can be compared to the tidewater area that separates the sea from the land. It is a sloping, marginal region that divides non-knowing from knowing. Sometimes this area is very narrow and can be crossed in a second or so, as it is when we learn, for example, the score of yesterday's ball game. Again, it can be miles in width and be very difficult to traverse, as it is when we are learning how to play a musical instrument or to comminicate in a language other than our own. Many hundreds of hours of very concentrated effort are then required to go from non-knowing to knowing. One thiks of the immense tidal flats that lie to the west of M. Saint Michel in Normandy, upon which one does not dare venture without a guide.

Our professional use of the word learning refers usually to forman learning in what we call the classroom situation--a brand of learning of immense importance. This importance is recognized by all of us here, though this is by no means universally true in our culture, as the percentage of our national income that is devoted to education rather soverly indicates. As for the word knowing, for the sake of argument, let me hazard the statement that we know what we know by three different means, one, by perception, that is, through data received by the senses, two, by instinct, that is, through genes and chromosomes received from our parents, and three, by intuition, that is, by piecing together bits and parts of the residue laid down in our cerebral cortes by the first two processes. This is not a scientific statement, merely a poetic one. But perhaps worthy of consideration even so.

Whatever we may think about the role of instinct and intuition in knowing, we can all agree on perception. Let us speak about it in some detail. Talk about perception brings withit talk about cognition, and happily so, for one of the great themes of scientific psychology in our century has been the [illegible] the great events of scienfific psychology in our century has been the rediscovery of cognition. When I was in college, forty years ago, in the heyday of John B. Watson and behaviorism, the stimulus produced the responce, and that was that. You went from S to R and no nonsense. Nowadays, a small 'c' is inserted between S and R, opening up a world of possibilities for the student of language learning. For that little 'c' stands for cognition, which the dictionary defines as "that activity of the mind which receives sense impressions and elaborates concepts from them." A concept is defined as "an idea generalized from particular instances." It is perception that lets us observe a dinner napkin, a snowball, a lump of sugar, an Easter lily, and recognize each for what it is. But it is cognition that lets us extract from them a universal quality, whiteness, which all these possess, and lets us deal internally with that quality and give it a name, whiteness. It is perception that lets us touch an ice cube, a dog's nose, a trout stream, a cellar wall, and again recognize each for what it is, yet it is cognition that permits us to extract from them a xommon quality of coolness and naother of wetness, to give them names, and to recognize these qualities or universals when we encounter them again in other objects.

It is easy to conclude that pictures can represent particulars, the napkin, the snowball, the ice cube, the trout stream, in a very satisfactory way. On the other hand, the universals, whiteness, coolness, wetness, are far better represented by words. Whoever it was who first said: "A picture is worth a thousand words" forgot to add: "If we are seeking to particularize.: But, just as often, we are seeking to generalize. For passport identification, a picture is probably better than any number of words. But if we wish to refer to those inhabitants of this city who support its government by giving up a sizeable part of their yearly income in taxes, the single word "taxpayer" is surely better than a thousand pictures. Our understanding of the difference between talk and pictures, that is, between discursive and presentational forms, begins here. For it is the tendency of pictures to particularize and of talk to generalize.

The role of perception in learning and knowing is of course maximal, and the appeal of the talking picture is very great, with all its promise of selection, concentration, and control over what the learner will see and hear. Does the talking picture live up to this promise in the learning of a new language? Our answer will be conditioned by our definition of language and the differences we can find between seeing and hearing.

Further comment on perception brings us to the sencond item on our list, the five senses. The range of sight is practically limitless. With the eye we can easity travel to the moon, the sun, the stars, even to neighboring galaxies. We all know how deprived is the person who does not have at his disposal the sense of sight. The sense of hearing is far more limited, for sound, as perceived by the senses, travels only through the sea of air in which we live. It travels slowly and not very far. We can see our neighbour a half-mile away, but we cannot hear him. The third sense, ofor, requires the transfer through the air of odor-bearing particles to our noses, though the point of origin may be at some distance from us. Touch requires close physical contact with the object in question, sensitivity to touch being spread over all parts of our bodies. The sense of taste is the most intimate of all, for what is to be tasted must actually be taken into our mouths. Through perception and cognition we learn by means of our senses to know with what we are surrounded. Often more than one sense is involved in knowing an object. A glass of ginger ale, for example, has a message for all five.

The term 'aidio-visual', now apparently about three decades old, underscores the importance of sight and hearing in the processes of learining and knowing. I suppose a really thorough-going term would be 'audio-visual-olefactory-tactile-gustatory.' (And don't think such aids may not be on the market before long) The word 'audio-visual' is not meant to slight the other senses, it merely indicates the great predominance of these two. The term 'audio-visual' and the talking picture came onto being at about the same time. With perhaps more enthusiasm than discrimination, audio and visual have been used together very extensively, almost as if they were inseparable. Sometimes they have been asked to carry nearly the whole burden of instruction.

But nothing is the answer to everything, and a closer analysis of the phenomenon of language has revealed vast critical areas in which sound is totally independent of sight, and has made us rather startlingly aware of what the eye can do and cannot do, as well as of what the ear can do and cannot do. In order to understand in what profoundly different ways pictures and sounds bring information to the mind, we must consider the third item in our list, the physics and psychology of light and sound.

The unit of light is a photon, a tiny bundle of energy released as an electron shifts from one orbit to another in its race around the nucleus of an atom. Photons travel in enormous quantities and faster than anything else we know of. A brief glance at a scene or a picture of a scene gives us a great deal of information about it in an incredibly short time. The mechanism of the eye permits us to receive a message by means of light about the dimensions, color, and relative position of a great many objects, all in less than a second. To do this, however, our eyes must be directed the right way. If we turn our heads or close our eyelids, the message is cut off.

Sound comes to us in a very different manner. The air that touches our ears is set in motion by whatever makes the sound in a way not unlike the dropping of a pebble into a pool of water. Sound continues to reach us no matter what the position of our bodies, and we cannot shut offour ears as we can our eyes. The ear is very able in disticguishing between degrees of volume and qualities of sound. But a word message that is to be borne by sound takes much longer to convey and is often far less precise than a message borne by a picture. We should note in passing that the body can receive sound and also emit it. The human body does not emit light, though other living creatures do so. No doubt the whole story of communication would be far different if we were as gifted as the fireflies.

A fuller exploration of the differences between presentational and discursive forms (that is, between pictures and language) is not permitted us in this discussion. But the blunt truth is that we shall never understand talking pictures, and far less their role in education, until we take the time, muster the patience, and acquire the mind-set to make such explorations.

Of course a word message falsifies reality. No one thinks that a door is anything like the consonant and wowel sounds we use to represent it. Pictures falsify reality too. Nobody really thinks that the pack of cigarettes or the beer bottle that we see pictured in a magazine advertisement is actually paper-thin. And there is a double falsity in the motion picture, for, as we know, what is flashed on the screen is not motion at all, but a rapid succession of still pictures. The eye mechanism being what it is, we interpret these successive pictures as showing what in fact they do not show: motion. This is a good wxample of the relationship between perception and reality.

We must go on now to talk about language and the part it plays in the sound motion picture. Again, we must be precise in the meaning of our terms. By language we mean not the language of the bees or the language of the flowers, but the language of human discourse as produced by human lips and received by human ears. Language in this sense is a highly complex fabric of systems of sound, of form, of order and relationship, and of items of potential meaning. It is a behavior pattern typical of every living human being that has reached the age of three or four, although anything remotely comparable to it is totally denied every other living creature. Language is often accompanied by activities of the eye and the facial muscles, and by body movements of many kinds. Ingenious ways of picturing the sounds of language were invented a few thousand years ago, and have mightily transformed the entire human predicament. But a thorough knowledge of the true nature of language is denied us until we can perceive that, in the last analysis, all human language is reducible to what the lips can say and the ears can hear. This is a sweeping, indeed shattering, admission, one that the intellectual world is as yet hardly ready to make.

Different languages can come into contact geographically, socially, and often in the same individual. Instruction is a second language is a deliberate attempt to encourage this latter kind of contact. Whether the two languages in question are to be separate households, dwelling under the same roof but independently and collaborating only occasionally one woth the other, or whether the new language is to be adopted into the midst of the existing mother-tongue family as a minor, restricted, and dominated member of it, is still--strangely enough-- a moot professional point. This question raises its tousled psycholinguistic head in the foreign language film that has English titles. For students of the foreign language this produces a mental hodgepodge of a most disconcerting kind, and it takes no profound insight into normal language behavior to see why. Of course the observer wants most of all to understand the story. Trying to do this in two languages interferes with understanding and often blocks it off. Any good that this may do the student of the foreign language is very hard to discern; the harm is all too evident.

We must not leave our discussion of the nature of language without remarking upon its division into two major areas or streams, each parallelling the other when language is in action. We call these two areas 'code' and 'meaning'. Code comprises the sounds of the language, the forms and shapes that the word elements take, the patterns of order and relationship in which they follow each other in the stream of speech, and the word elements considered as bearers of meaning. Meaning is related to sound, form, order, and lexical choice at every point. The speaker puts meaning into the elements of code as he produces language and the hearer extracts meaning from the code as he listens. Now pictures can be extremely useful in illustrating meaning and making it precise. But the learner must learn not only meaning; he must learn the code as well if he is to communicate in it. Yet these are matters that cannot be pictured. We can easily depict the difference between a boat and a boot or a key and a ski, but to try to picture the production of the sounds that make this difference in speech is well-nigh impossible. We might as well try to teach a musician suppleness of the wrist or quality of tone through pictures. In summary, we may alsost say: pictures for learning the meaning of language, yes; pictures for learning the code of language, no.

Language learning is in many respects like learning music, for it involves the training of both muscle and mind in new and complicated ways. One radical difference, however, distinguishes language from music. Music is indeed individual behavior, with the musician performing solo or in unison or accord with one or several others. Language behavior, in its essence, is not individual behavior at all, but is a "dancing couple" or "boxing match" kind of behavior that seems to be best called dyadic. Participants in language interchange are not relating what they do to a pre-arranged background pattern in a given rhythm and a given key. Instead, each is guiding his activity by what the other does, has done, or is about to do, and by that only. The psychologists have not discovered this fact about language as yet, but some day they will. And when they do, they will be vastly more helpful to us in language teaching than they have been up to now.

After this discussion of theoretical matters, we turn now to the fifth item on our list, and make some practical suggestions about the use of sound motion pictures in a foreign language course, relating them as best we can to the principals er have proposed. To begin with, the language course must be set ip first. To start out by taking a sequence of motion pictures, no matter how fine they may be as such, or by diligently seeking out films already make, then attempting to build a language course around these presentations for the eye comes about as close to doing things up side down and backward as could possibly be. The successive steps to be followed in mastering the language code must be identified and arranged in order first, through an entire course that takes the learner to a point of recognized language competence. This is a length of time running, on the average, to three academic years at least. Only after these preparations have been made should we turn to pictures to complement this material in establishing appropriate meaning to accpmpany code. Proceeding in this way, we may hope for a cultural authenticity and a psychological aptness in the learning of meaning that will neither trivialize nor complicate and confuse the learning of code.

Secondly, we shall understand the function of the sound motion picture better if we distinguish between learning and performance. Once a given section or sections of code have been learned, the motion picture as well as the tape recorder can be used to supplement the live voice in giving the learner an opportunity to practice with what he has acquired. But in doing this we must be sure that the profile of sound is full and clear, and above all that it is not masked and clouded by the abomination of incidental music. Thirdly, there are added dimensions of meaning that develop with the use of language appropriate to persons who are relating in a normal way to each other and to the cultural situation in which they are. Such scenes can be presented in a uniquely effective way with sound motion pictures, provided, of course, that the basic elements of code have been learned first. Although the motion picture cannot engage the student in the dyadic of language (it doesn't have the necessary blood chemistry) it can, if rightly prepared, provide models of unique value to the learner.

As the student passes through the sequence of phases that bring him to a point of language competence, he of course has need of the most carefully prepared materials. It is now recognized that these can be prepared only through the coordinated efforts of language teachers, aided by the best advice and counsel obtainable from a number of adjacent disciplines in which language plays an important role. These are, especially, philosophy, literature, psychology, linguistics, and cultural anthropology. The sound motion picture can well become, with the collaboration of able motion picture production personnel, an integral part of such materials. It goes without saying that in pictures of this kind, the learning of language and of meaning must take precedence over what is theatrical, amusing, unusual, or quaint. With proper planning, documentary films can find their way into what we are discussing, provided they are honest documentaries giving a true report of life as it is, and are not falsified or 'storified'.

We arrive now at the sixth and last item on our list, the use of the sound motion picture in teacher training. The films that can contrubute most to the preparation of teachers are those that show the teacher in the act of teaching. Ideally, we would hope for films showing the teacher teaching the different skills, the varieties of sentence structure, the shaping and correction of pronunciation, the development of vocabulary, the creation and writing down of sentences and paragraphs, the giving of quizzes and tests. We would like to see the same teacher teaching the same class at different levels, teaching in big classes and in small, teaching students of greater and lesser potential as language learners, teaching students in college-bound courses and those not intending to go beyond the high school, teaching pupils in the fourth grade and in the twelfth. We would like to see films showing classroom dynamics and the varieties of activity possible in any language class, the teaching of word study, the use of the questionnaire, the use of literary texts in classes in which langiage learning is the dominant purpose. We would like to see films showing performances, such as we see at a concert or in a theatre. Also we would like to see films that are not performances but honest learning sessions, such as the rehearsals for the concert or the play that will later be given. Fils for teachers should show not only the right thing but also, occasionally, the wrong thing, plainly labelled as such. They should be good enough to be seen not only once but many times. In all such films, what the students say should be fully and amply recorded. Great care must be exercised in the editing of such films lest the honest documentation of what goes on in a classroom be tampered with and falsified. The essence of good language teaching is to be forst model, then interlocutor, then coach or guide. Films for teachers should show the teacher as all three.

My final plea would be that we not write down to, or talk down to teachers, that we not condescend, nor oversimplify, as if teachers were stationed intellectually somewhere between their pupils and the rest of the academic world. This has been the tone, the expectation, the practice in all too many books and materials prepared for teachers. For every teacher that I know who wants to be intellectually coddled anc carried along "Taddy, like you done through the toy fair", (as Finnegan said) there are, at the least, ten others who welcome the challenge of new concepts and new practices and whose arms are long enough to reach for a dictionary.

MY CONCERNS ABOUT THE APPLICATION OF PSYCHOLOGY TO INSTRUCTION*

Nelson Brooks
Yale University
August 1966

It is clear from the first word in the title that ny talk is to have a personal bias. This bias I not only admit but claim. I am a language teacher, with no competence whatever in psychology except that of an interested layman. I have had a long experience in instruction in formal education in American schools and colleges, but this instruction has been in the field of modern languages only. What I say will have to bear this bias and this limitation. I begin with some general remarks about psychology (not all of them flattering), ask why this field has helped so little in language learning, say something about learning theory and what it means in our field, refer to some philosophic considerations that underlie audiovisual, welcome certain hopeful signs in cognitive studies, and end with a docket of concerns about psychology and instruction.

When a layman first takes a long, hard look at present-day activities in the field named psychology, he is likely to turn away in shocked surprise, and say: "These people are sailing under false colors." For everyone knows that psyche is the Greek word for soul, and one might quite reasonably expect to find in "psychology" a study of the soul, or at least the spirit of man. Our inquirer soon discovers that the thousands of American professionals who earn their living as psychologists are officially concerned with nothing of the sort. He finds them instead observing and recording and measuring the responses of living creatures, both human and animal, (usually the latter) under carefully controlled conditions. It is disturbing and disappointing to find that the person to whom we have turned for help in redecorating our house and rearranging our furniture is able only to make minor repairs to the plumbing and to replace a fuse. This is not said to disparage the plumber or the electrician--it is just that we expected something more.

---

* For The Audiovisual Conference, Iowa, Aug. 1966.

If we push the precise definition of contemporary psychology to its limits, we discover that at the most we can say only that the psychologist studies the relationship of living organisms to their enviornment, whether worm or rat, dog or monkey--or the girl next door. The public image of the psychologist may be rather different from what most practitioners in the field suppose. A cartoonist, if asked to devise a coat of arms for psychology, might sketch for us the outline of a shield showing a rat at the upper left, a pigeon at the upper right, a pair of chimpanzees rampant on a field of banana yellow, with a string of nonsense syllables as motto. This may be only caricature, yet it is armed with such equipment as this that the psychologist is presumed to be able to help those of us who teach in giving our students the competence to communicate with the people of other nations, and to understand their culture and their literary and artistic heritage. There comes to mind the sentence of Susanne Langer who reproves careless philosophers for "letting ambitious genetic psychologists" as she puts it, "argue them from the conditioned reflex to the wisdom of G. Bernard Shaw, all in one skyrocketing generalization."

Those of us who daily face classes of young Americans in schools and colleges feel that it is simply not enough to watch our students learn how to succeed without really trying. All parents, including those who are professional psychologists, surely want their children to know the meaning of honesty, of fair play, of loyalty, of beauty, and of good taste. They want them to understand what the good life is, and to know how to live it emotionally and intellectually. They want them to understand dignity and charity and how to practice both. They want them bravely to face the frontier that marks the limit of what man can know. They want them to realize their potential as human beings and to develop this potential to the full. The naive teacher who turns to psychology soon finds that in that field little is said on any subject such as these.

But there are surprises in life as well as disappointments, and not infrequently we find something of great value that is other than what we were looking for. Can this be true of contemporary psychology? In all honesty we must report that it is. Whatever else it may or may not have done, psychology has helped us discover and understand certain basic facts of the unconscious and its relationship to learning, to motivation, and to our behavior in general. We must report, too, that some psychologists have made a serious effort to describe verbal behavior, even on the part of bilingual persons, as we see in the work of Wallace Lambert of McGill University. Some have sincerely tried to understand the mechanisms of language as they are analysed by the descriptive linguists.

From these efforts, so far, has come very little that is of positive help to those who must give instruction in a foreign language to learners in American classrooms. One reason for this is that there are some hard facts about language which the psychologists are not yet fully aware of. One of these facts is that we do not communicate by using single sounds. If we did, "k, t, m, a, z" could be a message, as it is not. Neither can we communicate through the use of isolated words. If this were true, then "starlike, splinter, waterfall, whenever, them" could be a message, as it obviously is not. It is only when words are incorporated into a molecule of speech, which we call an utterance or sentence, that we have something that is viable in communication, linking a sender and a receiver in understanding. The psychologist has apparently never realized that there is about the same similarity between a string of nonsense syllables and language communication as there is between a bowl of wax fruit and what we eat at the table. Perhaps the most serious blind spot in the psychologist's understanding of language behavior is his apparently total lack of awareness that this type of behavior is not individual but dyadic.

In an effort to explain more clearly the dyadic nature of language communication, I propose a model that will demonstrate what we may call "reciprocal functions." By this I merely mean a pattern involving two persons in which what one person does is steadily related in the most intimate way with what the other person does, and vice versa. To illustrate, we may imagine two people sitting in the sunshine in a room that has a darkened corner at the far end. Each person holds in his hand a mirror which reflects into the room a rectangle of light coming from the sun. With every slight movement of the subject's hand the rectangle of light moves along the wall and about the room. Since the movement of this patch of light is directly related to the movement of the hand, we call it a function. Suppose now that subject B superimposes the rectangle of light he controls on the patch of light controlled by subject A, thereby doubling its brightness. Then let subject A move his spot of light along the wall and around the room while subject B follows, attempting as best he can to superimpose his rectangle of light upon that of subject A. Let this continue for a short time, then instruct subject B to take the lead and subject A to follow, as B has just done. In this model we have something that resembles a spoken conversation between A and B, in which the thought expressed by A is a function of his use of the language code and B's understanding of A's thought is a function of his decoding of A's message. I have labored this point because I find almost no evidence, so far, of awareness on the part of psychologists that it is in this dyadic pattern that language behavior is learned and normally used. In a word, we may say that language communication is a two-player game in which solitaire is useless in the learning and not very popular in the performance. Hence we call it dyadic.

Every language teacher knows that there is much more to language behavior than the signals received by the learner and the signals emitted. Why is so little said by psychologists about the internalized bahavior that is so obviously a major factor in the success of instruction? There can be little doubt today that Watson, Weiss and company, with their mechanistic approach to human behavior and their Stimulus-Response formula, did a great disservice to formal education in the United States, at the same time creating in the field of psychology a distraction and a misplaced emphasis from which it has not yet fully recovered. The language teacher is convinced that there must be something between S and R, and insists that efforts be made to find out what that is.

Language teachers are also mightily perplexed about being sure that students "know" what the words of the foreign language "mean". We do not pursue the quest of knowing what words mean very far before we find ourselves hot on the trail of how we know what we know. This trail leads directly to epistemology. It is a brave psychologist who is willing to use such a word as this. Yet we find Jerome Bruner using it with reference to Jean Piaget, giving him greatest credit for his work in this area. This reuniting of psychology with philosophy can only delight the language teacher who, because he must deal with people as he finds them, knows that he must forge ahead as best he can, often through areas into which the scientist is not yet prepared to go.

From now on, all discussions of learning theory as applied to formal education must take into account the following trenchant comment by Jerome Bruner: "The psychology of learning has only been tangentially concerned, until very recently, with the optimal means of causing learning to occur. Very little of learning theory is given over to the designing of optimum orders of encounter for the learning of materials.... How can material of a certain kind be so presented and so sequenced that it will be most readily and most transferably learned? The results of such research would provide a basis for a theory of instruction that is complementary to a theory of learning. ...Not until we have developed a theory of instruction will we be able to test propositions about the best way of teaching something."

When such statements as we now have from learning theory are applied to the field of language, we must bear constantly in mind the chronological age of the learner. From the point of view of language learning, there are four definitely marked periods or ages in a person's life. He is first an infant, then a child, then an adolescent, then an adult. The first period ends at the age of about twelve months, the second at the age of about twelve years, and the third at the end of about twenty-four years. During infancy, the child does not produce language, though he produces all the sounds that will eventually be incorporated into his speech. During childhood, one learns all the deep grammar of one's mother tongue and becomes literate. Throughout this period, language behavior continues to be a most important activity. Much of the flexibility and adaptability that enables the infant to learn any language or any culture still remain. With adolescence many other types of behavior begin to compete for attention. To a marked extent, the flexibility necessary for adaptation to another language, both physiologically and psychologically, is diminished. The need to analyze language is, for a number of reasons, more strongly felt, and the sense of feeling at home and at ease in any language other than one's own becomes more and more difficult to attain. Although the ability to learn by following a model tends to grow less, in compensation the ability to learn through insight increases. Intellectualizing about language now not only satisfies a need but may be of considerable help in gaining language competence. As the individual grows older, these two opposing tendencies continue to increase. In childhood, the motivation to master language is strong, if for not other reason than simply to belong to the human community. In adolescence, of course, the power of this motivation is greatly lessened though other types of motivation may take its place. In adulthood, language learning is usually not even attempted unless there is strong motivation of some sort, though it usually differs from what is active in earlier years. In any event, both adult and adolescent are bound to recognize that as far as learning a second language is concerned, the child usually does it more easily, more quickly, and better. If extracting the basic language pattern from a given sentence and applying that basic structure in generating another different sentence is to be termed problem-solving, let it be called by that name. But let us remember that every child the world over engages in this type of problem-solving by the time he is three or four years old, with amazing success.

Language signals come to us through both ear and eye. The term "audio-visual" was not proposed solely for matters of language, but words as well as pictures are a part of what is referred to by the term. We must pause a moment to note some of their characteristics and the radical differences between them. Both the eye and the ear are astonishingly sensitive. The smallest unit of light is a photon, generated as an electron moves from one orbit to another in its motion around the nucleus of an atom. Now an atom is fantastically small, yet it takes only a half-dozen photons to register an impression on a subject's eye. The ear is so perceptive that if its sensitivity were multiplied by a factor of only four, it could register and relay to the brain the bumping of molecules against one another in the air.

Information through pictures comes to the eye "en bloc", whereas verbal information comes to the ear in linear fashion, like beads on a string or clothes on a line. The psychological results of these physical facts are brilliantly analyzed by Susanne Langer in the fourth chapter of her book Philosophy in a New Key, a chapter entitled "Discursive and Presentational Forms", which should be required reading for anyone who wishes to dig beneath the surface of "audiovisual." The ear is not match for the camera-like eye when it comes to receiving a vast amount of detailed information in a very brief time. The ear, however, does not need to be directed toward the source of the stimulus, and it works perfectly well in the dark. Pictures are most successful when we wish to particularize. A photograph of a person or a place establishes identity with an efficient precision that words can never hope to equal. On the other hand, words have a capacity for generalization, a freedom to conceptualize that is denied to pictures because of their closer ties with reality. Man uses visual space perception to the full; this is not true of auditive perception. In visual perception, both hemispheres of the brain are needed for normal vision. In listening, one hemisphere is fully adequate for normal hearing. There is a temporal quality in what is received by the ear, and this is contrasted with the spatial quality in what is received by the eye, a distinction that lies at the basis of Langer's discursive-presentational analysis. This time-space dichotomy should inform all basic thinking about audiovisual.

In the light of this analysis, the ideas of Marshall McLuhan appear interesting but only partially satisfying. He has keenly sensed the difference between linear perception, such as we have in spoken language (and also in music) and the all-at-onceness of what the eye perceives. What McLuhan has not observed--and here he is one of a very large company--is that written language is in a special case in the visual field, for, in contrast with everything else that the eye perceives, language retains almost entirely the linear characteristics of the spoken language from which it derives.

It may be of interest to recall that when I coined the word audiolingual, back in 1957, I did so while thinking about audiovisual and its relationship to the classroom revolution that was gathering momentum in modern foreign languages. Fortified with Susanne Langer's notions on presentational and discursive forms, and the psycholinguists' separation of speech in action into the three strands of talk, gesture, and writing, I was attempting to relate language behavior to the term audiovisual which had been proposed some three decades before. It seemed to me that the "audio" part, in order to reflect what goes on in language, had to be expanded onto "audiolingual", on order to include the hearer-speaker dyadic. By the same token, "visual" had to be enlarged to "visual-graphic" to account for the role of the eye in reading and in writing. All this, of course, is an extraction from the broader meaning of audiovisual, which refers to all that one hears and all that one sees, whether language or not. We may note in passing the attempts on the part of some language teachers and some psychologists to make audiolingual into a "method" of teaching. Such attempts are both amusing and irritating, for they reflect a misreading of the nature of language behavior and a gross insensitivity to the meaning of words.

What likelihood is there that psychology will soon again be in a position to aid with the problems of classroom learning, perhaps even resume the study of what its name implies? We remember that contemporary psychology is a science, or tries its best to be. Yet science in many fields has turned up quite unexpected facts and has more than once reverted to discarded notions that had been held long before. Who would have thought, only a few years ago, that the particles of the atom would be found sticking together by reason of forces that are neither magnetic nor gravitational, but of a third order, not yet understood? Who would have thought that non-conducting metals would, when cooled to a point approaching absolute zero, suddenly and surprisingly become very conductive? There was a time--and I am old enough to remember it--when the transmutation of elements was a disreputable academic joke, on a par with the horoscopes of astrology. We all know with what dramatic finality this notion was reinstated as a most radical fact of created matter. There was a time, in the decade from 1850 to 1860, while the psychologist Fechner was writing his Elements of Psychophysics when it was hoped that psychology might, through the careful observation of outward behavior, yield insights into the true nature of the inner man. At that time, psychology was still entitled to call itself by that name. But it happened that the inner man was lost sight of, so much so that his existence was often flatly denied, a position maintained by many psychologists today. Language, of course, is one of the major meeting places of the material and the non-material. This was clearly perceived and described by Ferdinand de Saussure in 1908 in his remarks about the code and the meaning of language. It may well be that the study of language will enable psychology to revise its emphases and to renew its progress toward its original goal.

Already we find Jerome Bruner urging psychologists to re-enter the field of education. He has himself shown what may be accomplished through fresh approaches in his studies of cognition and instruction. Let me give you an example. In a recent television broadcast a five-year old boy who, a day or two later, was to be the ring-bearer at a wedding, was asked how he would carry the ring. He answered by both words and gestures. The words were "I'll carry it carefully." The gestures were to put both hands in front of him, side by side, palms up, as if carrying something, and to take a few steps forward, walking gingerly. This was an "enactive" response. The words accompanied the moments, but were, with regard to meaning, quite superfluous. It was excellent pantomime. He was then asked what the ring was like. In reply, he made a circle of his thumb and forefinger and said as he looked at it, "It's a big little ring with a word inside." This was an "iconic" response, with the thumb and forefinger picturing the shape of the ring. The accompanying words parallelled the picture, but added something more. A third question asked him who his three godfathers were. He named them one after another. There was no attempt at gesture of any kind. This was pure symbolic use of language with words referring to nothing in the environment, and serving as quite satisfactory surrogates for the persons being referred to. These distinctions in behavior and the terms I have used for them come straight from a new book by Bruner entitled Toward a Theory of Instruction. From a language teacher's point of view, this is one of the most welcome books to come from psychology in a long time.

Now, to summarize these rambling comments on psychology and instruction, may I offer a list of the concerns that to me seem most pressing.

I am concerned lest psychologists not fully realize the need of the human being to symbolize, lest he not give sufficient credit to language in the various kinds of symbolism in which man engages. From the arresting statements of Susanne Langer some twenty years ago about this basic human requirement to the recent researches concerning the role of dreams in rapid eye movement sleep--and the consequences of being deprived of this symbolic activity--come indications of imperative needs that must be met if the organism is properly to adjust.

I am concerned lest the psychologist fail to understand the nature of the language teacher's basic problems. For example, the psychologist may find that an experience abroad does more for successful language learning than work in a language laboratory at home, and recommend the first as preferable to the second. Now the language teacher has not need of psychological research to tell him this. But the language teacher's work does not take place within the cultural field of the target language but outside of it. The falsity of the comparison is due to the psychologist's lack of understanding of the circumstances in which the language teacher must work.

I am concerned lest the psychologist continue to think that the infant learns his mother tongue simply by imitating and repeating words used by those about him. On the contrary, he has a well developed repertory of sounds, including all those that he will need in using his mother tongue, before he first breeches the language barrier at the age of twelve months. His mind is not a "tabula rasa" upon which the language of those around him is inscribed. Instead, he learns the trick of language by making his activity coincide with theirs, and thus reaches an agreement as to what the language sounds are to stand for.

I am concerned lest the psychologist not distinguish adequately between the code of language--the grammar of its sounds and forms and order patterns--and its vocabulary. Unless this distinction is adquately perceived, the psychologist may be deceived into thinking that vocabulary is the only significant bearer of meaning, whereas structure may be a far more potent factor than he suspects.

I am concerned lest the psychologist remain unaware of the fact that listening and reading are by no means passive responses, but are receptive ones in which actions of many kinds are in progress.

I am concerned lest both psychologist and linguist impose a constant factor of interference upon the behavior of the bilingual person, when in fact interference may frequently function only sporadically and with no great strength, if at all.

I am concerned lest the psychologist not separate sufficiently the different roles of the ear and the eye in total language behavior. The fact is that the center of gravity (if we may use the term) of language has moved away from spoken speech and toward language on paper--a movement that gained great impetus with the invention of printing in the fifteenth century. But this must not be allowed to obscure the more basic fact that for both the individual and the race, language is and must remain, at bottom, a phenomenon of sound. It is true that the mechanisms of language can be restated in symbols receivable by the eye rather than the ear--a modification that has produced an astonishing upheaval in human affairs since the invention of writing--but the eye alone can never put the individual in command of language as communication. This is made pathetically clear by the efforts of the congenitally deaf to speak.

I am concerned lest the psychologist remain so intent on the effectiveness of the tools which he has devised that he will not give sufficient attention to the precise formulation of the question that is being asked, nor to the appropriate interpretation of the answer that is forthcoming after his experimentation and research.

It would be easy to list a dozen crucial questions that we who teach languages would like to have answers to, answers which only a psychologist can help us obtain dependably. It is not my purpose to go into these details here, but I should like to insist that only the language teacher can adequately place quite separately in another code. Not to have had this experience is find answers through experimentation and research. When answers are found, only the language teacher can satisfactorily interpret those answers in terms of the classroom needs which he encounters daily.

Finally, I am concerned lest research in second language learning be directed by those who are themselves monolinguals who have not had the inner experience of rendering the mother tongue inactive while communication takes place quite separately in another code. Not to have had this experience is tantamount to being unable to understand the processes that have become central issues in language teaching programs in American schools and colleges today. Try as he may, the blind man cannot conceive the nature of color. Try as he may, the monolingual cannot know at first hand what it is to communicate in another man's language.

THEORY AND PRACTICE OF LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION*

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

The title assumes that there is a theory of language and that there is a theory of instruction. As far as I know, we do not have either one or the other. If we had a theory of language, it ought to take into account, among other things, the nature of language--that is, a thorough analysis and description of what goes by that name; the function of language, and especially the significance and value it has for those who use it; the origin of language, which is, so far, one of this planet's best kept secrets; the history of language and of languages, and of their diversity and their relationship to each other; the acquisition of language, either as a mother tongue by infants or as a language learned later in life; the potential of language for other uses, especially in the field of literature, and the unique role of language in setting human beings apart from the rest of the natural world.

If we had a theory of instruction, it should, in our field, take into account the objectives of a given course of learning, what the learner already knows, how much he can learn and wants to learn, what learning materials he is to make use of, the circumstances in which he is to work, the teaching techniques that will be used as he learns, the training of the teacher to play his part in the instructional process, and the use of measurement instruments both to indicate what progress has been made and to improve teaching and learning.

---

* A talk given to the Teaching Fellows at Harvard University, Sept. 21, 1966.

If we cannot turn immediately to comprehensive studies of these two vast subjects, we can at least review some of the aspects of language and certain instructional procedures that arrest our attention when we observe what is taking place in a language classroom.

We may begin with meaning, for it is the special task of language--by this we mean the sounds produced by the human voice and picked up by the human ear--to carry meaning from the speaker to the hearer. Meaning is conveyed by many other ways than language, such as a wink or a wave of the hand. But it is the special task of language to bear meaning, and if by chance it does not do so, we soon find it tiresome or irritation. Our interest is in what language means and it is also in how language means. Pursuing this course, we soon find ourselves asking what meaning means, and how it is we know and understand. At this point we realize that we have gone off the deep end into epistemology, and are in need of help from philosophy.

and it is also in how language means. Pursuing this course, we soon find our-

Another aspect of language that strikes us at once is language as a text. By what mysterious process can the modulated sounds of the human voice be substituted for by wood pulp and printer's ink, with the latter still performing essentially the same task as carriers of meaning? What psychological subtleties are called into play when one symbol system, relating point by point to a vast semantic, gives way to a totally different symbol system with relatively little change in what is being represented? Of course we note that the text cannot reflect all the modulations of the voice, but we note at the same time, that once language has been captured in the form of text, it can be manipulated, stored, transported, and transformed in ways not possible when it is wholly airborne. What are the special characteristics of language when reduced to a text? What are the relationships between speech and writing? These are the proper questions of philology, a very ancient discipline that has much to say about this important aspect of language.

A third aspect, to all of us here of great importance, is language as it plays its part in the fine art of literature. I have found it useful, as a language teacher, to distinguish between language as an art and literature as fine art. This distinction is not always immediately apparent. I think of two books that are helpful in making this difference clear; you may know them both very well. One is Wellek and Warren's Theory of Literature, the other is The Sense of Beauty written here in Cambridge by George Santayana nearly a century ago. Of course language and literature are inextricably mingled--few poets print their poems without words--but I would make a strong plea for understanding the differences between the two, especially on the part of those who are language teachers and at the same time are pursuing advanced studies in

are language teachers and at the same time are pursuing advanced studies in

literature. I am convinced that both language and literary studies will profit as a result.

Still another aspect of language is that language is something we do, which is another way of saying that language is behavior. But there is nothing passive about this behavior. Even the simplest kind of listening involves perception and cognition that can in no way be equated to acquiring a sun tan or rolling down hill. When we are producing language, both nerve and muscle are involved in behavior patterns of great complexity. It is this aspect of language that appeals to the psychologist, for it is such a critical area in the total pattern of human behavior. The learning of language, performance in language, and measurement of success in language acquisition are all of much interest to the psychologist.

Closely related to language as behavior is the aspect of language as a system, or as a nexus of systems, highly refined and superbly integrated. We are often struck by the ease with which one moves from one skill to another and from one role in language to another in the mother tongue as compared to the fumbling and groping we observe when one attempts a second language. This ease is deceptive, however, and is in fact less an index of what a stupid oaf the learner is and more a reflection of what a complicated instrument language is, and the credit we deserve for handling our native tongue as well as we do.

Since the nineteen-thirties, a relatively new discipline called descriptive linguistics has made available to us many remarkable discoveries about the systems of sound and form and order to be found in language. These discoveries have brought about and are continuing to bring about radical changes in our understanding of what language is and how it works. If you have not already done so, it will be your privilege and your pleasure this year to share in the results of these inquiries. The present-day language teacher is in great debt to the descriptive linguist, and you are sure to find the results of his researches quite apparent in the materials you use to teach by, the techniques you employ in the classroom and in the learning results which you help bring about in your students.

to the descriptive linguist, and you are sure to find the results of his re-

The final item in my list of aspects is language as an artifact. This word takes us, of course, to the field of cultural anthropology in which language, as a product of human ingenuity and as a central feature of every cultural community that ever existed, is in very high esteem. In fact, when anthropologists are in search of what may be said to represent a culture in its purest form, they are very likely to say: language. And we can only agree, for it is hard to imagine, for example, anything more French than French.

I have gone through this list of aspects of language because I wish to share with you a conviction I have come to hold as the years have gone by: that there is far more to language learning and language instruction than we have in the past supposed. Because language learning seems to take place so easily and successfully when conditions are right, the academic world has rather blandly assumed that it was a relatively simple matter to recreate these conditions and obtain the same results. The time has come to admit that such an attitude is untenable, to recognize that good language instruction is a formidable task and to establish it as a discipline that merits respect in the academic household. It is by relating what the language teacher must know and do in the classroom to the appropriate insights and findings available to us in the disciplines I have referred to that we may be in a position to bring this about.

Before leaving this consideration of the six related disciplines, we should note that three of them are classed as humanities and three of them as sciences. We all know on what different premises these two separate groups base their studies and their conclusions. Whatever may be our personal preferences and persuasions, it now seems clear that the language instructor must learn to be

persuasions, it now seems clear that the language instructor must learn to be

comfortable in relating to all of these disciplines, for he is certain to find much that is of value to him in every one of them. Whatever may be the attitude of one of these groups toward the other, the language teacher is well advised to keep in tune with all these fields, to seek out appropriate findings in their reports, and to invite their counsel--but then, of course, to make decisions in the light of his own discipline.

You can already see that the theoretical background for language instruction is to a considerable extent uncertain and incomplete. Yet *teach we must*, and I turn now to certain practical considerations that this necessity presents. In classroom practice, certain events stand out as being related in a critical way to what is attempted. Among the most important of these I would list the following: meaning, the use of English, translation, grammar, the skills (especially writing), tests, questionnaires, culture, and continuity. Let me say a few words about each of these practical matters.

It may be useful to define meaning as infra-verbal and ultra-verbal. Meaning does not reside in the sentence itself; meaning is inserted into the sentence by the person who generates it, and is extracted from the sentence by the person who receives it. In a gross comparison, we may say that the sentence is the box and meaning is the content. If the two are well matched, the content fits the box, and vice versa, like a violin in its case. This, by the way, gives us a clue as to why translation is often so unsatisfactory. In translating, we try to change boxes and not content. Often, is spite of our best efforts, we end up with our violin in a peach basket.

One can make a strong case for reducing English to the vanishing point in the language classroom. Two reasons are especially cogent, one psychological, the other cultural. The teacher can shift from one language to another with skill and ease but for the student the circumstance is far different. For him, one language is a floor to walk on, the other a tightrope. The psychological readjustments asked of the student are obvious, and he will tend to stay on the floor if he can. The cultural reason is that in the country whose language is being learned English is not valid. To be in a situation in which English simply won't work is a cultural experience that any language teacher can provide--and one that students welcome.

A further word about translation. At the bank we can change a dollar bill for a certain number of francs or of pesos. This equating, though legal and financially satisfactory, is in fact only superficial. What a dollar will buy in the United States is by no means the same as what a dollar's worth of francs or pesos will buy in their respective countries. The student can take his words and expressions to the lexico-grammatical bank and exchange them for their equivalents in another language; he still must learn what they will buy in terms of cultural meaning in the new country.

The word grammar means many things. It may refer to the structures that are activated when language is in use. In this sense, there is never any language without grammar. It may also refer to a verbal description of language processes--language talking about itself. This is a fascinating activity, in high regard in the academic world. But note that language can, and does, function perfectly well without this kind of grammar. Many a young child can run and not be able to tell the precise difference between running and walking. Many a child can produce a conditional sentence, using a "future less vivid," yet be quite unable to describe in those terms what he has done. It will help you in understanding the role of pattern practice in language learning if you keep in mind these two different meanings of grammar.

The analysis of language, going from its larger to its smaller forms, can take us from the chapter to the paragraph, the sentence, the phrase, the word, and to the consonants, the vowels, and other vocal sounds. But for the purposes

and to the consonants, the vowels, and other vocal sounds. But for the purposes

of communication, the smallest unit that is valid is the sentence. It is important to remember that we cannot communicate by individual sounds or even by individual words. Meaning will fit only into something that has the characteristics of a sentence. This is not to say that the lesser units are not important; they are. But consider this: when we drink a glass of water, we are drinking molecules. Now, there are electrons in every one of those molecules, but we cannot pour out and drink a glass of electrons. When we butter a roll with a silver knife we are making use of an aggregation, almost pure, of atoms, mostly of silver, some of copper. In every one of these atoms there is a nucleus and in every nucleus there are protons and neutrons. But don't try to butter your roll with neutrons! I am stressing this point to remind us of the limitations of minute language analysis when we come to classroom instruction.

Now something about receptive and productive skills. From George A. Miller comes this interesting list of the steps we go through as we receive a linguistic utterance. First of all, we merely hear it, and we can tell, if nothing more, whether it is loud or soft, fast or slow, near or far, and perhaps something about the person who uttered it. The next step is to match it internally with something already present in our heads. Proof of this matching would be our ability to echo what we have heard. Thirdly, we accept the utterance as a sentence belonging to a given language, or not accept it, as the case may be. Fourthly, we interpret it according to the meaning it bears--or fail to interpret it, as in such a sentence as: I hear a blue perfume. Fifthly, we understand, and this may entail far more than what the words themselves normally relate to. For example, in certain situations, the statement "The coast is clear" may have nothing to do with the seashore or smuggling but merely indicate that the bathroom is now available. Finally, we may believe the statement, and if so, we are likely, sooner or later, to act upon it.

We can find a companion to this analysis of the receiving of language in a list of rules given by Eric Partridge for producing language. Basically, he says, it must be intelligible. Next, it should be clear. Third, it should be adequate and suitable to the situation or context in which it occurs. Fourth, it may even have elegance of effect and economy of effort. Lastly, it may have a quality that would fall somewhere between charm and beauty. These analyses are worth having in mind as our students develop the various skills under our instruction.

In our review of practical matters we should say a word about tests, and begin by distinguishing between the class quiz, the bi-weekly hour test, and the term examination. The brief class quiz is more for learning than for grading; the bi-weekly hour test is for review and consolidating what has been learned as well as for measurement; the term examination permits, essentially, the evaluation of work done in an entire course or portion of a course and of the right to continue. In all of these there can be a positive feedback from testing to learning; if tests do not contain this important feature, they lose much of their justification.

I cannot forego the opportunity of talking with college instructors about the use of questions in the language class. Somehow, at some former time, there crept into the folklore of language teaching the notion that tha only real way to get a student to talk was to ask him questions. The device works, after a fashion, though extracting the answers often makes the teacher feel like a dentist. Yet we should remember that in real life very little of what we say is produced in answer to a series of questions. Most of our speech is in the form of statements or rejoinders to statements made by others. If it is our aim to get students to produce sentences on their own, we should not complicate their problem by overwhelming them with questions. These are often far too long, are sometimes more difficult than the text being read, and pose problems that must be solved before the learner can even start to create a sentence of his own. For those who may wish to vary the question routine, I offer these suggestions. Remind your students, first of all, of the variety of sentences they are acquainted with. One can make a list of twenty or more in a short time: declarative, interrogative, negative, imperative, relative, conditional, passive, and so on--it's a good idea to put the same sentence into all these different forms. Then present the class with a list of key words and phrases culled from the text being read, and invite the students to make up different kinds of sentences about them. You will be agreeably surprised at the results.

I have come to have deep respect for the sentence, largely because of its critical position in communication. I invite your special attention to the sentence in your teaching. After an extended experience in producing sentences, both oral and written, the learner may be shown how a string of isolated sentences can be interrelated to form a single well integrated paragraph. Then, and not until then, is he ready to attack the problem of composition. The nub of this suggestion is that the topic be identified, then the main lines of its development worked out orally with all members of the class participating. Only when this is done is the student asked to proceed on his own and put pen to paper. This preliminary oral discussion can then inform as many separate treatments as there are students in the class--yet nearly all the resulting compositions can be classified as vertebrates.

I am also adding to this list the obligation--I should almost like to say requirement--that colleges relate what they do to that which the schools have done before them. The urgency behind this statement may be difficult at first to understand. But language learning as it takes place in formal education is a long process, and often much the better for being long drawn out. Because of this, continuity and articulation require more attention on our field than in almost any other. A thousand facts now indicate that language programs in schools have greatly changed and improved in the last decade. But unless related changes take place in collages, the valuable effects of these improvemtnts may be diminished and lost, and the likelihood of their continuing may be greatly lessened. To come straight to the point, colleges must now be informed about school programs, must take the student where he is and build directly on the competence which he brings to the freshman year.

It may help if we look rather closely, for a moment, at what this long sequence of learning entails. We may say that there are three major objectives of language courses: control of the new language, an insight into its culture, and an acquaintance with its literature. As the years go by, there are three major phases through which the student passes; we may label the first of these as the basic course, the second, language competence, and the third, cultural and literary acquaintance. In the basic course, the student learns the norms of spoken speech and is introduced to all the skills; in the second phase he keeps alive all he has learned in the basic course and in addition becomes acquainted with the norms of written language and has an extended experience in reading, writing, and vocabulary building. In the third phase there is further development of the language skills and in addition much time is given to studies that can be called cultural and literary. All colleges would be happy to receive students who, before beginning their freshman year, have completed the second phase, language competence. The third phase is quite properly college work, though it is not infrequently done--and very well done--before the student comes to college. Problems arise when the college is put in the position of having to complete (sometimes redo) the second phase. How this is to be accomplished is something we cannot go into at this time, but my point is that it should be done in such a way that the learning already established is not negated and lost. For the most part, students in schools now learn language as communication, not only face-to-face communication between speakers but also writer-to-reader communication in books. They learn, as best they can, to do with the new language what its native speakers do with it. Obviously, elaborate grammatical explanations and translations from one language to another can play only a very minor part in early courses presented in these terms. Grammar and translation have a role to play in the total language learning experience, but they have been located at a different place in the sequence and receive a different emphasis. It is hardly right to penalize our students for not knowing how to do what they have never been taught to do.

A new dimension in language instruction is about to be much more fully developed. To this we might give the name "cultural apperception". We are all well acquainted with the more formal aspects of culture; literature, music, the arts, architecture, the dance, many facets of ancestral heritage, many details of social form and personal refinement. What still awaits exporation is what we may call deep culture, culture as the anthropologist understands it. This relates to the belief and bahavior patterns that characterize all members of a linguistic community and give to the whole group and to every member of it not only a language but also a set of values and a way of life that is uniquely theirs. As yet, we who teach languages do not know how to go about the study of deep culture, much less have we applied a systematic analysis to any single culture in a way that can be useful in instruction. It is already clear, however, that one most important focal point in such a study is to be found in interpersonal relations. In what different ways do men relate to men and women to women, and each group to the other? In what different ways do the young relate to the old, and the young to each other and the old to each other? How do the wealthy relate to the poor, the educated to the uneducated, those who are on home territory to strangers? All these varieties of interpersonal relationships and a thousand more are reflected in a remarkable way in language. The language instructor is about to have as an additional assignment the developing of an awareness of these variations in approach and the linguistic subtleties that reflect the attitude of one individual toward another. This is a mere glimpse of what lies ahead of us in this area; you are certain to hear more about it.

We could spend the rest of the afternoon talking about practical matters of one kind or another; the principal point I wish to make is that all practical procedures can be and should be related to valid theoretical considerations. This, I think, is what must be done if we are to dignify language instruction with the intellectual status that it merits.

If I were asked to characterize the state of advancement in which language instruction is at the present time, I should be tempted to say that we are still in a primitive stage--post witch doctor but pre-Model T. I would add that notable advances are being made, and above all that we are aware of a new respect for language instruction. It may well turn out that the most human characteristic of the human being is none other than his ability to symbolize through language. The rising tides of ethology are now beginning to surround us and we shall need to look sharp to discover that by which our humanity, such as it is, can be salvaged. Language may remain our one best hope. If so, the language instructor is likely to merit a more important place in the academic world than he has enjoyed in the past. This is not a display of false modesty but an honest appraisal of the situation as it seems to be. It is, I think, a good posture to assume. I believe it was Confucius who said that the awareness of ignorance is the beginning of wisdom--or blessed are those who know that they don't know.

Humanizing Instruction Through Foreign Language Study*

Nelson Brooks --Yale University

The subject of my talk was not of my choosing nor did I word it in the way in which it appears in our printed program. But when I came to think about it and to organize my thoughts in some systematic fashion, it seemed to me that a scrutiny of each word as it appears in our title would be interesting and enlightening. The title itself, then, is the outline of what I have to say.

There is a cluster of English words all built upon the Latin word for man (homo, hominem): humane, humanity, humanities, humanistic, humanize, humanization, humanitarian, and still others. They are all words in common use. Although each one has its special area of reference, they are all written over a common denominator of dignity, gentleness, generosity, nobility, and culture. Or, as you see, man in the best sense. Two of these words are of special interest to us, the humanities, in the plural, and the verb in our title, to humanize.

As we take up words one at a time and examine them closely to see what they stand for, and have stood for in the past, it is often arresting to note how clearly they imply what they do not stand for. The most immediate implication of humanizing would appear to be "not brutalizing." The humanizing of man is a process that began a long time ago. It is still going on, and is not yet even near completion, as the front page of any newspaper or any TV news report quickly shows.

Even instruction is sometimes brutalized. We can observe this in many a passage in novels and autobiographies. Take, for example, the scene in Mark Twain's Adventures of Tom Sawyer in which Becky Thatcher is about to receive a whipping for having torn the schoolmaster's anatomy book and is saved by Tom's dramatic pronouncement: "I done it!" -- which earns him a merciless thrashing and also these words from Becky: "Oh Tom, how could you be so noble!" The drama of this scene rests squarely upon the brutalizing of instruction.

---

*An address given at the State Conference on Foreign Languages, Albuquerque, New Mexico, 20 May 1967.

This is a backward look, and of course today instruction is, in this sense, humanized. Looking still further back, we find a time, perhaps five hundred years ago, when 'to humanize' had a different implication: 'not to theologize.' This meaning of humanizing is closely related to the basic thinking of the Renaissance, with its interest in natural phenomena, in the languages and the literatures of the classical age, and the focusing of attention upon the present life rather than a life hereafter. Our debt to humanization and to the humanities thus understood is of course enormous, for this set of ideas has thoroughly penetrated our way of thinking and living.

There is a third rejection implied in the word 'humanize' which is directly applicable to the world of today, and that is 'not to mechanize.' In America we have been very successful in debrutalizing instruction. And our United States Constitution, by separating the functions of church and state, effectively detheologized our teaching. We can then ask: Have we 'de-mechanized' instruction? Well, as we all know, we have not, and probably we should not.

Our problem is rather to keep mechanization in its place. We live in an erector-set age, or perhaps more accurately we have been living in an erector-set age. We are apparently advancing now into an age that has made an important addition to strips of metal held together by nuts and bolts, an age that is tuned to the action of free-moving electrons, tiny particles that fly about in enormous numbers and at a speed almost equal to that of light, that make our household appliances work, that keep our factories going, and that enable our computers to count, store, and retrieve. For us in this mechanical-electronic age the critical questions are: To what extent is the word humanizing, with the meaning of 'not mechanizing' germane to the problems of language instruction? Will our curriculums remain at least as humane as they now are and perhaps become even more humane because of foreign language instruction? Before we attempt a definitive answer, let us spend a little time preparing the terrain.

We who teach languages today find ourselves in a position that is at once fortunate and embarrassing. Fortunate because we have public support for and interest in what we are doing -- to which fact there is tangible testimony in the form of generous federal funds to assist us in teacher training and retraining, in the preparation of new materials, and in the devising of new techniques of teaching and new types of tests. All these are designed to further the learning of languages as communication, by which we mean communication between speakers and communication between writer and reader. We are fortunate also in that as a profession we have recognized our responsibilities and our immediate assignments and are facing up to the new challenges in the best way we can. Positive evidence of this is the presence here of the audience in this room today.

We are also fortunate in that we continue to receive from disciplines that are adjacent to ours new ideas, new concepts, and new understandings concerning the nature of language and the nature of language behavior. We are grateful for these new concepts and new insights and we are doing our best to profit from them.

Now why do I say that, to a certain extent, our present position is embarrassing? Our embarrassment is not unlike that of a host whose guests, filled with enthusiasm and agressive ideas, completely forget in whose house they are and proceed to think and act as if they were back in their own homes. This circumstance of "hospitality in reverse" is effectively set forth in the play The Man Who Came to Dinner.

I have two disciplines in mind when I talk of guests, one of which is linguistics. Now, we language teachers invited the linguists into our household during the second World War, for we needed them, desperately. And they, along with the missionaries, taught us many things about language as communication that we simply did not know. As the years have gone by, the linguists have tended to forget that whereas their task is to analyze and describe language, ours is to see that languages are learned. While their interest is essentially analysis, ours is synthesis -- for if learning is not synthesis it is nothing. We are, in a sense, travelling in opposite directions. The linguist, so confident that he is right about his description of language, has come to have a proprietary attitude toward it, feeling that only he really understands it, and that whatever is done about language -- even language instruction -- must have his stamp of approval.

The limitations in the linguist's approach to language as we know it in our classrooms are simple but profound. The linguist is a scientist, and he operates upon the philosophy of science. He constructs an edifice of truth by laying one provable fact upon another. Whatever does not lend itself to counting, weighing, measuring, mechanical observation and statistical analysis gets short shrift from the scientist. For several decades the word 'mentalism' has been equated by the linguist to unmitigated nonsense. Yet those of us who teach the young in classrooms day by day know quite well that science is not enough when we are dealing with living human beings, and with that which is the very life blood of their mental processes: language.

Science says that the strength of light diminishes with the square of the distance from the source, a fact that is easily proved and that is important in aiding our students to see the books and blackboards with which they work. The Old Testament says that a soft answer turneth away wrath; the old proverb says that a stitch in time saves nine. But can we prove these statements as we can prove the lessening of light? Suppose we carry out some experiments, record and tally our observations, and find out that the average stitch in time saves only seven -- or perhaps as many as ten? Should we change the old adage and make it: A stitch in time saves plus or minus nine?

I say these things to remind you of what you know very well: that we are not going to find all our answers in science. As far as language is concerned, we need not only a theory of language but also a theory of language users -- and this takes us out of the realm of linguistics and into the realm of psychology.

Are the psychologists to be included among the guests who sometimes forget for the moment in whose domain they find themselves? They are indeed -- and we did not even invite them. In the past they have blandly assumed a right to play in our sandbox. Many a research volume has been filled, and many a reputation established, based upon what psychologists have taken language learning and language behavior to be. Their concept of language has been mechanistic and behavioral. To them language has been, for the most part, strings of unrelated words, or pseudo-words, which they call nonsense syllables. Large portions of the theory of learning have been based upon the learning of language in these terms. To those of us who teach modern foreign languages, the notion of basing a theory of language learning upon nonsense syllables and paired associates from two languages seems to fall somewhere between the shocking and the ludicrous. Human beings simply do not communicate in terms of nonsense syllables, they do not communicate in terms of isolated sounds, they do not communicate in terms of isolated words. If you do not think that these statements are true, let me tell you something. Here is a message: mmm... zzz... lll... uuu. Did you get it? Here is another message: raindrop, fool, button, mahogany, flash. Do you agree? Do you wish to argue?

We are forced to admit that language in use comes in packages no smaller than a sentence or an utterance. Anything less gives us raw ingredients, but not human behavior. Note that as we admit this, a great deal of psychological research washes down the drain.

But these two disciplines, linguistics and psychology, are moving forward too, just as we are in language teaching. If at times we must say to them, politely but firmly, that language teaching is our house not theirs, this does not mean that we are any the less grateful to them for their brilliant discoveries about the nature of language and the nature of learning.

Thanks to the writings of such persons as Jerome Bruner, Lev Vygotsky, George Miller, Noam Chomsky, Jean Piaget, and Eric Lenneberg, to mention a few, we are now in a position to understand far better than we did what goes on within our students' heads and in their overt reactions when they learn to use a new language.

I would like to describe for you two models or outlines that result from certain new insights set forth by these authors, for, as you will see, they relate directly to the word that was our point of departure, humanizing.

One of these models is a spectrum or rainbow of activities, having one end deep within the mind of the individual who speaks and writes, and the other in a printed book that may have just come from the press or have been printed long ago. We may identify the colors in this rainbow -- by that I mean the discernibly different areas in this spectrum -- as follows. We begin with the speaker's consciousness, a term that was for many decades anathema to the psychologist, but is so no longer, at least to some of them. Adjacent to this is thought, and next to that, thought in words -- a designation that indicates that not all thought is verbal. Next comes inner speech. So far our individual has not spoken. Words are, as we say, on the tip of his tongue, but as yet are not articulated. Presently he speaks, and we call the new area spoken monologue. After this comes dialogue, then normal social talk, next formal language expressed in speech or writing, and finally literature with its characteristics of fine art. This model of the phases of language behavior, which results from reading the authors I have mentioned, is one with which the language teacher finds himself immediately comfortable, for, with a little reflection, he soon realizes that what he does for and with his students and what they eventually learn to do for themselves, coincide very well with the various areas of this behavior spectrum.

A second model which can be derived from the present thinking of psychologists and linguists is a refinement of the de Saussure description of language as a dual stream of code and meaning. When looked at closely, the meaning channel can be divided into two sectors, one of potential meaning, the other of actual meaning for the user, when language performs in communication. We may call these two sectors logical meaning and psychological meaning, or potential meaning and actual meaning. Somewhat more technically we may use the terms semantics and pragmatics. This gives us a triple strand discernible in the stream of speech, the three strands being designated as syntax, semantics, and pragmatics.

Let me give you a homely illustration of what I mean by the distinction between semantics and pragmatics. Here is a story that I heard many years ago. A social group in a certain chruch was putting on a play for the members of the congregation. The parson himself had an important role in the production. At the climactic moment he was to be shot at by the villain at close range. The lines of the play at this point called for the parson to say, "My God, I'm shot." Being a parson, he had some reluctance about uttering these words, but out of respect for the integrity of the text and for the greater glory of Melpomene, he agreed to say the lines as written. His reservation, however, was not completely overcome. At each succeeding rehersal he said these lines with less and less enthusiasm. On the night the play was presented, the stage director placed a cranberry in the barrel of the pistol that was to be pointed at the parson. At the critical moment the villain took aim, and the shot was fired. The parson put his hand to his chest, and said, with little conviction, "My God, I'm shot."

Then he looked down at his chest, saw his hand and his shirt-front covered with red, and exclaimed, promptly and in full voice: "My...God...! I am shot!

The difference in character and effect of these two renditions is exactly the measure of the difference between semantics and pragmatics. In semantics we find what language can mean; in pragmatics, what it does mean to those who use it.

For my part, I welcome these new insights, especially the concept of pragmatics, because for me they indicate that the psychologists are at last beginning to blaze a humanistic path through the tangled thickets of behaviorism and mechanization.

Up to now we have been speaking of what humanizing is not: "not brutalizing", "not theologizing", "not mechanizing." We must now attempt to say what humanizing is. Our ultimate question, I suppose, is "What is it to be human?" One way to answer is to find those who are almost human but not quite, and observe the difference. In the animal world, those who come closest to being human in body and in mind are the apes, in particular the chimpanzees and the gorillas.

It is only in the last half dozen years that we have begun really to understand these animals, by having observed them, not in captivity in cages and zoos, but leading their normal lives in their natural habitats. The list of ways in which they are like us grows longer. But one important difference remains.

Though the apes make vocal sounds, just as we do, and though they appear, in simple ways, to symbolize, they have not learned and apparently cannot learn to use vocal sounds as symbols and put two of them together. It may surprise you to know how much time, effort, and cold cash have been expended by psychologists in the attempt to get apes to talk. The conclusion is that if it could be done it would have been done by now. And it hasn't. In a way, this is a relief. It's reassuring to know that there is at least one thing, language, that marks us off from them. The human use of language is denied to the other apes apparently because of genetic inheritance. There is something in our genes and chromosomes that they do not have.

Being human, then, starts with the use of vocal sounds as symbols. A word of caution is necessary here to avoid confusion and misunderstanding. It is true that animals use vocal sounds as signs, that is, to refer to what is in the immediate environment, just as we do. But symbols can refer to what is not in the environment at all, and is not expected to be. A bluejay utters a characteristic call to warn other bluejays of an approaching cat. But he does this only when he sees a cat. You can say "cat" to your dog and get an instant reaction, because he either sees one or expects to see one. But bluejays seldom talk to each other about a cat that appeared the day before yesterday. And your dog has only a very mild reaction when you say to him: "Now Rags, it's all right for you to chase tiger cats, but you must never chase a black cat." It is important to see this distinction clearly for it is the act of symbolism -- and not merely the use of signs -- that frees the human spirit from the bondage of the present moment and the immediate environment. This ability of the human spirit, principally through the aid of language, to move about in time and space, is unique. It is a truly human prerogative that is clearly denied all other living creatures. This, I believe, is what Emily Dickinson had in mind when she wrote:

> The brain is wider than the sky,
>   For, put them side by side,
> The one the other will include
>   With ease, and you beside.
>
> ...
>
> The brain is just the weight of God,
>   For, lift them, pound for pound,
> And they will differ, if they do,
>   As syllable from sound.

Human beings symbolize in other ways than in language, as is made brilliantly clear in Suzanne Langer's book Philosophy in a New Key. Mathematics, music, pictures, rituals, are all different and important modes of symbolic transformation. But not all of these are available to everyone from the first year of life onward, as language is, and no other has in the same degree the power of language to generalize.

Language, then, is the fulcrum upon which being human, and therefore humanizing, rests. If you think this is an overstatement, let me cite for you two cases of people without language, and how their circumstances changed when they finally gained it. One of these cases is factual, the other is fictional. The factual case is that of Helen Keller, whose book, The Story of My Life, should be read by every teacher of language.

At the age of eight, Helen Keller was an intelligent, high-strung, frustrated, animal, without sight, without hearing, and without speech. The story of her release from this prison of isolation through the sense of touch is a high point in the history of humanization. She learned, with the feel of running water in one hand and the moving fingers of her nurse in the other, that symbols could stand for things, that every thing had a name, and that she could refer to things whether they were present or not. This simple beginning with the experience of language led to her graduation, some years later, from Radcliffe College.

The fictional story is that of Gertrude in André Gide's Pastoral Symphony. Gide had heard of Laura Bridgman and although, with a notable disregard for fact, he misspelled her name and placed her in England instead of New England, he made use of Laura Bridgman's story. In his short novel he tells how a blind girl, Gertrude, was discovered at the age of about fourteen, an orphan, pitifully poor, and without language. In a relatively short time she learned to talk and to read, and changed from someone in a decidedly animal condition into a charming, cultivated young woman.

The point of each of these stories is that the critical humanizing factor,the sine qua non of being human, is language.

What we are saying in these two cases applies, of course, to one's mother tongue. What can we say about the significance of learning a second language? The humanizing process related to the learning of one's mother tongue is already far advanced in the case of our students. What can be added by the study of a second language? What does such a learner who has made significant progress have to his credit that is not possessed by one who is monolingual and monocultural?

A first answer has to do with the deep grammar of language. This deep grammar is what is possessed by every child when he begins his first grade in school. At first appearance it may not seem to be very much. But on closer inspection it is indeed remarkable. Every first-grader knows about singulars and plurals, about tenses and pronouns, about questions and negatives, and even about highly sophistocated relative and conditional sentences. He has a vocabulary of several thousands of words. And he certainly sounds like a native speaker.

Of course he cannot talk about these things, or tell you how he handles them so well, any more than a bird can explain to you how he flies. The point is that he uses language with great facility. Ahead of him, of course, are studies in surface grammar, in the more formal dress in which language can appear. Ahead of him is the task of learning to read and write, of learning how language can conform to literary traditions. Ahead of him are many experiences in increasing his vocabulary, a process that goes on throughout life. The point of interest here is that he has learned his deep grammar without awareness, without analysis, without formal instruction, and almost without effort.

The learner of a second language who, like our students, has to find his way into the new language in the circumstances of formal schooling, must learn deep grammar in part in the same way and in part in quite a different way. Although he will never learn it as well as he learned the deep grammar of his mother tongue, the experience gives him a new insight into the nature and function of the verbal symbol as it stands for the reality within him and about him.

This intellectual discovery and exploration of the nature of language and how it works has been given a very high rating by humanists for many centuries, and it is still held in the greatest esteem. The unique opportunities offered by second language learning for sharpening such perception are of course only too obvious.

A second result of the learner's efforts is that through the pursuit of pragmatic meaning in the new language, he can gain insights into the thought, the value system, the way of life of the people in the target culture that are not available, in the same direct way, to those who have never learned a new language. This is what we really mean by the term "cultural objective."

A third advantage is that, as he progresses in his studies, and becomes interested in the literature of the target culture, he can now read it not in translation but in the language in which it was written. All of us who work in more than one language know that translations can never do justice to the original. Sometimes they are almost as good although in a very different way, sometimes they even seem to be an improvement, as the Old Testament in English at times appears to be when compared with the original Hebrew. But sometimes official translations are surprisingly inadequate. Consider the French "baccalauréat" translated as "College Boards." Sometimes they are grotesque, as in the French "sauce hollandaise" translated as "Dutch gravy." Each language has a uniqueness in its syntactic and semantic areas, to say nothing of the pragmatic, that lends credence to John Ciardi's statement: "In translation, all one can hope for is a respectable failure."

A fourth result of the study of a second language, perhaps the most important of all, is that the learner at length begins to see the predicament of life from a somewhat different angle. It is as if one were viewing a statue which the monolingual can see from one position only, whereas he who has an additional language can move away from this single position and can now see in the statue depths and dimensions that before were invisible to him. This too is a potential return for the student of a second language and it is bound to have a humanizing effect upon him.

May I summarize what has been said up to this point by noting that, in the last analysis, language is the basis of all humanism and that we are not even human without it, that the mechanization of language study is now being brought into a better balance with the humanistic and spiritual dimensions of language, and that the study of a second language can provide the learner with humanistic experiences that are not directly available to the monolingual.

Are we to assume that these desirable results will be brought about by a FLES program? -- any FLES program? Will they be brought about by two years of study in a junior high school, or two years in the senior high school? Will they automatically follow because curriculum time and classroom space have been provided, because teachers have been retained, and materials -- even integrated materials -- have been purchased? Because we have installed a language laboratory? Because students in large numbers have been guided into electing the study of a foreign language? The answer to all these questions, as I am sure you are aware, is an unqualified No. Under the best of circumstances at least four years of study are normally required in formal education in order to provide the student of a second language with a competence that can be called respectable. I know that in special cases this time can be shortened, but at the moment we are talking not about the special but the general. And these four years must follow a sequential plan, leading, as whole numbers in a series do, from one to another without gaps and without repetition. If there can be more than four years, all the better. If there can be an early beginning, as in FLES, still all the better, and we now have statistical evidence of this in the report given last December by John Carroll concerning language majors in their senior year in college. The planning of the language course must aim toward the three objectives: language competence, cultural insight, and literary experience. The learner must first of all gain freedom from English, then participate as best he can in the native speaker's use of language and meaning of language. He must pass with appropriate speed through the imitative phase and receptive phase into the creative and productive phases in which he initiates language on his own. In all this, the dyadic of language, the give-and-take of face to face communication and the reciprocal interaction of writer and reader must be brought into play.

There are, no doubt, many ways of accomplishing these ends. Certain ones have been tried out in recent years on a vast population and have been found productive. The use of dialogues, structure drills, basic sentences and pattern generalizations, the identification of culture in language, the use of literary texts as a basis for language work, all have proven their worth. There may be other and better ways, but until we find them, these will serve us very well.

All this, of course, demands competent teachers and suitably designed materials. Happily, the supply of both is now increasing, in numbers as well as in quality. As a profession we still have much to discover and to learn. But we can surely find some satisfaction in looking back at the ground we have gained since that critical year, 1952, a decade and a half ago. During this period language instruction has not disdained the offerings of technology. On the contrary, it has accepted them and put them to excellent use. At the same time it has not relinquished its honored place among the humanities. I do not believe it has any intention of so doing. I do not believe it could do so, for, even if it should try, it would soon rediscover the ineradicable fact that language is to the human soul what water is to the sea. Without it there would be a vast human desert. This may well have been in the depths of Saint John's thought when he wrote: "In the beginning was the word."

Let me refer once more to the title which was our starting point. What I have tried to bring out is that instruction in a foreign language, if rightly construed and rightly implemented, adds a new and unique dimension to the use and the understanding of language. In so doing it englightens the learner concerning the fulcrum upon which all humanism rests: the capacity to symbolize in words.

TESTING FOR THE THREE OBJECTIVES: LANGUAGE, CULTURE, LITERATURE*

Since we are to talk about measurement, I will begin by saying a few things about what it is we are to measure. We are engaged in teaching a second language to pupils in American schools whose mother tongue is English. Implied in this statement is a triple objective of which we are not always fully aware. We shall be in a better position to talk about tests if our three objectives are first made explicit.

It is now generally agreed that we wish to provide our students with a control of the target language that is comparable, as far as it goes, with that of those who speak the language natively. This is a very ambitious objective. It is all too obvious that we cannot make native speakers of the pupils in our classrooms. One's native language is far too deeply rooted in every individual speaker and in the culture to which he belongs for this to be possible. But if we say that native speaker competence is a total area of which the second language learner can control only a small part, can we not hope to make that control valid within its limits? In the light of what has happened in our schools and colleges during the last decade, we are confident that this can be done.

Language competence, then, meaning the competence that a second language learner can hope to attain, is the first of our three major objectives. Before going on to the others, it may be worth while to take a closer look at what is meant by the term language competence. Language occurs both in the air and on paper. Our students need an extended experience with language in both these forms. Furthermore, language is something that is received, as in listening and in reading. But also, language is something one initiates, as in speaking or writing. Here again, our learners are entitled to an extended experience with language as a receptive activity and as a productive activity. In addition, like any other complicated system--and language is astonishingly systematic--language may be analyzed. Language analysis is an intellectual exercise that is in high repute in the academic world; there are times when it is very useful to the learner of a new language.

---

*A talk given at the Foreign Language Institute, Vare Junior High School, School District of Philadelphia, 11 September 1967.

We may restate the foregoing in a rather different way by saying that our students must learn the sound system, both how to understand it and to produce it. They must learn to read and write. They also should develop a reasonable control of vocabularly and syntax. And they should intellectualize, to a modest degree, about the communication system they are learning to use.

Beyond all this, there are styles or modes in language communication. We speak to a newspaper boy in a manner quite different from the way in which we address a clergyman. The sixteen-year old writes a letter to a friend in a stlye quite different from the one he uses when writing a theme in English. Martin Joos in an engaging little book entitled The Five Clocks distinguishes five levels of style and calls them: Intimate, Casual, Consultative, Formal, and Frozen. Intimate style is exemplified in the boyish chatter of Huckleberry Finn. Frozen style is illustrated in the ponderous Biblical utterances of Winston Churchill. Our learners merit a receptive experience with all these styles. They are well advised to remain on middle ground when they produce language themselves.

But language competence in itself is not the entire story. Our learners must know not only the sounds, the syntax, and the vocabulary of language, they need also to develop insight and awareness as to the meaning of these linguistic elements for the native speaker of the target language. We are distinguishing here between the system that we call language and the reactions of those who use that language. In most of the languages on the continent of Europe, there are several equivalents of the single English word "you". There is nothing in phonology or syntax or vocabulary--that is, in grammar--to tell the learner which of these words is the appropriate one for him to use in different circumstances.

We must make a transition from the language itself to those who use it. Doing so, we find ourselves in a territory very different from language, and therefore with another objective in our language courses. This we call the cultural objective.

The teaching of culture is an area of interest to all of us, and it is not surprising that language seems a natural point of entry into the area of a foreign culture. Our position here is well taken for, although there is much more to a culture than its language, nothing else seems to exemplify the culture in quite so pure a form. What, I often ask, is more French than French? What is more characteristically Russian than the way in which they speak their language? Yet in spite of our many attempts to teach culture, we have so far not been very successful. This is very largely due to the fact that the word 'culture' is an overloaded word, one that turns out to have almost as many different meanings as there are colors in the rainbow. But these different meanings can be sorted out, just as the colors in sunlight can, and instead of merely talking about light, we can treat red as red and green as green--as we had better do, for example, when we are weaving our way through traffic. We must enquire more deeply into the meanings of culture, give each of them its proper place in our curriculum, and then, in turn, measure how successfully the new concepts are learned by our students. I shall return a little later in my talk to the problem of culture and how it may be taught and tested.

But now let me complete our list of objectives by naming the third one, which is Literary Acquaintance. You may ask: Why this concern for literature in what is properly called a course in language? Two replies suggest themselves at once. One, schools are a part of our academic hierarchy. In the value system of the academic world literature stands very high. The more we respect the values of the academic world, the warmer will be our welcome in it. A second justification for the presence of literature in our language courses is our students' need for intellectual stimulus as they advance in language competence. Not only are they entitled to an experience, even though brief, with language in its artistic form;

their growth in language competence is enhanced if they are at the same time dealing with persons, characters, life problems with a dimension of realism, imagination, and esthetic quality that nothing less than literary selections can provide.

The proper role of literature in the language class is a complicated subject about which we have time to say only a very little. But I believe our day's assignment will not be complete until we have made some reference to it. Please recall the name of this objective: "literary acquaintance." I would be the last to recommend that we presume to teach literature as such in our language courses. But we have all participated in litarary courses, we know the rewards that such studies bring, and I see no reason why a foretaste of literary studies should not find its place in our programs, provided that language remains throughout our dominant concern.

Here is a suggestion of at least one way--admittedly a very simple one and I know there are many others--in which we may go about the study of a literary text. I believe you will see the value of this outline when we come to a description of tests. There are five points we may have in mind when we approach a piece of literature. The first is identification. What is the title, who is the author, what was the date of publication, hat was the literary period in which it appeared, what other works of this author do we know of, what contemporary events accompanied its appearance? The second point is form: What is the genre: prose, novel, short story, poem, theatre? What is the length? What is the level of language in style and difficulty? Do we find description or action or both: What is the role of the author in the piece itself? The third point is the subject of the piece, which amounts to a précis of the story that is told or of the ideas presented. The fourth point is analysis: What is the structure or framework; how is the theme presented and developed, brought to a climax and eventually resolved; What is to be said about characterization, atmosphere, style? The fifth point is evaluation:

what was the author's intent, stated or implied? in what measure was he successful? And last, but not least, what is the reader's verdict?

It is not enough merely to enumerate these three objectives, language, culture, and literature. We need to know also how small or how large a part each of them plays at different points of advancement through the language course. This makes it necessary to talk not only about the content of the curriculum but also about its sequential structure.

On two points I am sure we will all agree: a language course must go on for a long time and it must be continuous throughout that time. The number of class hours per week may very, being greater or smaller, but to break off completely with the intention of beginning again after a lapse is as inefficient as it is unfair.

Let us consider first an ideal language course without reference to school or college, then see how this may relate to the school grade or the college year in which the learner may be. Two terms will be useful to us in relating the parts of the language course to the whole. These terms are: level and phase. We may consider that a language course is divided into three phases, the first a Basic Course, the second Language Competence, and the third a combination of language, culture, and literature. Each of these three phases may be separated into two parts, each one called a level. This scheme permits us to consider the second level of each phase a complementary part of its first level. It also permits us to consider the end of each phase as a definitive milestone at which point a reasonably accurate measurement of advance can be made. We may note in passing that standard tests now exist that measure very satisfactorily at these three points: the MLA COOP Test Level L at the end of the Basic Course, the MLA COOP Test Level M at the end of Language Competence, and the CEEB Advanced Placement Test at the end of Phase Three.

Now let us see to what extent this utopian scheme fits the reality of our classrooms. As we know, the learning of a second language is begun at more than one point in our school systems. Some pupils begin at the third grade level, or the fourth, others do not begin until the seventh grade, still others not until the ninth. As for completing the course, this is sometimes done in the schools; very often it is not completed until the student has reached collge. Many students leave the language course at the end of the first phase. Many more leave at the end of the second phase. The reduced number persevers through the third phase, continues in college with literary courses, and a very small group of these eventually turns out to be language majors and even language teachers like ourselves.

Things were not always thus. The present state of affairs is the result of many quite recent changes in professional policies, in teacher training, in materials, and in tests. As we know, the federal government gave us a great professional assist beginning in 1960 by preparing both materials and tests for courses starting as early as the seventh grade and continuing on into the twelfth grade and into college. Up to now, materials for a beginning earlier than the junior high school have not received wide professional attention. Because of this, there are not yet available broadly based tests for what can be learned during the years in the elementary school. We can hope that the new language association now being formed, the American Council on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, will soon be in a position to approach this important matter in a manner that it merits.

I have developed the notions of curriculum form and content at this length because, as I said at the start, we need to know what it is that we are to measure. But we should not take this to mean that tests should be developed separately from the curruculum. Quite the contrary. A good curriculum and a good test program go hand in hand. Perhaps a better metaphor would be: go as two voices in canon form in music, one a little ahead of the other. We should note, though, that it is the curriculum voice that must lead, with the test voice following a few bars later. If this order is reversed, we run the risk of having our courses dominated by tests, which I believe we will all agree is a Bad Thing. An outstanding example of this was to be found in the foreign language field prior to the year 1941. For many years before that time, the College Entrance Examination Board published its yearly tests a few months after they had been given. The result was that from one end of the country to the other, in good schools and in poor schools, courses were given in CEEB examinations. Some of you who are present may remember those good old days and the kind of classes that were the result. The Second World War put an end to this practice. Beginning in 1942, the Board tests went underground. Since then, as far as I know, the Board had not published a single complete foreign language test, only a selection of sample items. This too is probably a mistake on their part, for a complete test has a total structure that a teacher needs to contemplate and assimilate if he is to do his best by the students who are to take the test in question. You will perhaps say that I am criticising the Board both for giving too much and for giving too little, that I am very hard to please. You may be sure that the people at the CEEB will not mind our saying these things. They profess to thrive on an attitude of criticism, and even encourage it. Taken as a whole, the Board is extremely competent, quite benign, and very well off. Those who formulate its policies are really our friends.

I said a while ago that I would return to the subject of culture and describe in greater detail how we may teach it and test it. As some of you may know, I am now preparing a paper on this topic, to be published by the new A C T F L. It is, at present, in the form of an imcomplete draft, thirty pages long, and it would take me an hour to read it to you. Since I cannot do this, I would like to review some of its main points for you, as they are germane to our subject. [1]

In spite of what we have often taught in the name of culture, we are bound to recognize, on second thought, that culture is not the same as geography, nor history, or folklore, nor sociology, nor literature. It is not even the same as civilization, although all too often we use the two terms interchangeably.

A glance at the headlines of any newspaper reminds us that even if all that we do may be called cultural, not all that we do can be called civilized.

Culture, as the foreign language teacher conceives of it, is always personal. Its focus is upon life situations in which we all continually find ourselves, and upon our thoughts and actions as we encounter them. What counts is what we are expected to believe and to do--and our conformity to these cultural patterns. Of course there will be frequent reference to geography and history, to economics and sociology, even to literature and the fine arts. But interest remains centered upon the individual. We can separate culture in this sense into two main divisions, one that is visible and recognized while the other is not. One is reminded of the iceberg, one-eighth of which protrudes above the water for all to see while the rest is hidden, but most surely there. We can name the part that protrudes 'formal' culture of 'manifest' culture, the hidden part 'deep' culture. Examples of formal culture are birthdays and prizes and advanced degrees. Examples of deep culture are conscience, language, and religious belief. It appears that we are on the threshold of a new and better understanding of culture and that this is sure to have an effect upon the content of our language curriculums and the nature of our tests.

We need now to recapitulate in the briefest possible form the curriculum content of the various phases and levels. In phase one, the Basic Course, our student learns all the sound system--vowels, consonants, and intonation patterns. He learns the syntax of spoken speech: order, forms, agreements, and phrase structure. He becomes acquainted with all the four skills, with an emphasis upon the audiolingual. The vocabulary he is expected to learn is minimal, and the words themselves are always in the context of sentences and utterances, these in turn being in the context of situations involving various speakers. This phase requires a minimum of two years' time and often lasts longer, depending on the age level at which the learner begins and the amount of class time in any given week or year. During this time he does not attempt to read extensively nor to build a vocabulary for the sake of vocabulary.

The cultural objective is a constant factor throughout the first phase, as it must be if our learners are to use the new language as its native speakers use it. From the beginning the patterns of address, the formulae of politeness, the use of proper nouns and titles--in authentic form--are a part of the learner's experience in this phase. These are properly not linguistic matters, but cultural. There are of course many other ways in which we can provide our classes with cultural information through the use of pictures, footnotes, and special readings. In this connection it is worth remarking that we can ask our students to read on cultural matters in English, then in class they can profitably listen to the teacher talk on the same subjects in the target language.

In phase two we encounter, in language study, the syntax of writing (often notably different from that of talk), develop the learning of vocabulary and idiom, read extensively both literary and non-literary texts, keep alive and develop further the audiolingual skills acquired in phase one. Oral exposés and the writing of sentences, paragraphs, and eventually compositions are specific goals. The cultural content of this phase consists in understanding the various meanings of culture and how one may in a language course gain insight into the target culture through language usage, pictures, and the reading of texts. The literary content is found in readings chosen for their literary merit. Though they serve principally for the development of language competence, they provide the teacher with an opportunity to draw attention to both the cultural and literary qualities they contain.

Phase three continues the development of the control of language, includes more and more varied literary texts, with greater attention paid to content and appreciation. Culture will of course be an important element in such texts, but now the student should read about subjects specified under the various meanings of the word culture, and he can begin to make cross-cultural comparisons that help him realize that he too lives in a culture.

We come finally to tests themselves. With your permission; I will talk about them by asking a series of questions, then, as we go along, propose an answer to each one. My first question is a very general one: Why must we have tests? There are obvious answers, such as the constant need to rate our students for various reasons and the need to know whether what we are teaching is being learned. I suggest a third reason: the student's need to know how well he is doing. Related to this is his increased motivation to do better and accomplish more when the significant factors in a good test program are fed back into the learning process.

Question: Is testing part of the teacher's responsibility? or does his obligation end when he comes to the borderline of curriculum? My reply is that testing is indeed the teacher's responsibility, for two reasons. One, that the teacher is working in the dark unless he can prove to himself and to others that he is doing what he thinks he is doing. The other is that testing itself is condemned to work in the dark unless it has the benefit of the teacher's knowledge and direct experience of the teacher-learner relationship.

Question: What different types of FL tests are there? There are three general types of tests: the home-made, the ready-made, and the standardized. The home-made or teacher-made test is a rather amateur product often constructed in a hurry and administered without benefit of editing. Sometimes teacher-made tests are quite good, but in general our home-made tests are not something that we can professionally be very proud of. I shall speak about ways of improving them in a few moments.

The special characteristics of the ready-made tests are that they are printed and that they come from out of town. Much time and thought have gone into their preparation and they are sent out to schools in the hope that they will measure accurately what the students have been learning. Examples of ready-made tests are the New York Regents examinations or the contest examinations issued by our various language associations.

The third type of test, the standardized test, differs from the first two essentially in that it has benefited by the lengthy collaboration of specialists in mental measurements and language teachers. Any standardized test is the result of a number of sequential steps that we may enumerate as follows: a session on specifications (how many items, how many item types, how many parts, how much time, etc.), a period of item writing (the creative part of test making), a session of editing, a program of pre-testing, a phase of item analysis, another period of editing in the light of this analysis, and assimilation into ultimate forms. All this is followed by norming, for the purpose of comparing one type of school with another, and equating, to make sure that one form of a test measures in the same way as another form. You may be sure that all this takes a great deal of time and a great deal of money. It is safe to say that no standardized test comes to the teacher until it has been worked on for at least a year and has encountered costs running into many hundreds if not thousands of dollars. The advantages of the standardized test over the other types are simple but crucial. Every item of a test of this kind has a pedigree, proving whether it is easy or hard and whether or not it discriminates accurately between those who have learned and those who have not.

Question: Is it possible to transfer from standardized tests to teacher-made tests some of the high quality of the former? It is indeed, and the following questions will elicit answers that will show how this may be done.

Question: Should each teacher make his own tests? The answer to this is both yes and no. Every teacher should make tests for his own students, yet before giving them he should invite the critical editorial comment of at least one colleague. This simple step will often eliminate directions that are unclear, help to remove questions that are too easy or too hard, or have too much of that quality we sometimes call "tricky" which results in poor discrimination on the part of that item.

Question: Should tests be given at random? that is, whenever the time seems appropriate, or should they be given according to a regular pre-arranged program? The answer is probably strongly in favor of the regularly scheduled test program. There are few language courses that cannot be rendered more stable, more intensive, and more productive by a regular procedure of this kind. If you have doubts about this but have not tried it experimentally, you will find it worthwhile to follow such a program for at least a semester and judge for yourself.

Question: Should English be used in F L tests? The consensus voiced by both language teachers and psychometrics specialists alike is that every test item should be in the target language and in that language only. It is often more safe and more fair to give instructions in English, but in the questions themselves English should not appear.

Question: Can dictation be used as a part of a test? The answer is yes, with two major provisos. One, that the students first have an opportunity to study the text from which the dictation comes, and second, that the taking of a dictation is not used as the sole measure of a student's control of the foreign language.

Question: How can class quizzes be related to hour tests? It is probably best to use the quiz principally as a learning device, but also to acqaint the students with the techniques to be used in showing their control of the target language during tests. If by the use of quizzes students are introduced to such techniques as answering questions in the negative, relaying a message to somebody else, changing from one tense to another, replying to question by substituting pronouns for nouns, and the like, they will then be able, when test time comes, to demonstrate their knowledge of the language itself without being puzzled by the techniques through which they are expected to show what they know.

Question: Can the making of tests be turned into a departmental enterprise? This should be given serious thought by any language department. Ways can usually be found to test for the common denominator of material that will have been treated in all classes without inhibiting the individual teacher in his own way of teaching--a priceless ingredient we must preserve at all costs. Teachers can take turns making tests, divided up perhaps into committees of two. It is well for any group to make several tests in succession for this is an area in which one learns by doing. It is a good plan also, when possible, to have a test specialist, one person who has the overall responsibility for the test program.

Question: Is a considerable knowledge of technical detail basic to the making, giving, scoring, and grading of a series of tests? That is, do teachers need to know about statistics? The answer is that such technical knowledge is not really very important, though of course it can help. A book on language testing published only a few months ago by Professor Rebecca Valette of Boston University entitled Modern Language Testing illustrates how a modest acquaintance with statistical analysis can be useful in getting the most out of tests.

Question: What are the most significant items in making, giving, scoring, and grading teacher-made tests? In the making of the test, the main thing is to be constantly aware of the growing edge of the learner's knowledge. This tends to keep one from testing on what the student learned long before or what he has never encountered at all. The best advice is: make tests not for yourself but for the learner. Test those areas of language in which the learner's control is being established. The three main points in giving the test are that the instructions be simple and clear, with examples where appropriate, that the questions themselves be presented either to eye or ear with all possible clarity, and that the student not be distracted--even by the teacher--while he is attempting to give his answer. The scoring of a test is essentially a matter of identifying what is right or wrong, applying this criterion to small units and to large. There are times, of course, when a two-valued criterion must be expanded to include as many as five, such as excellent, good, fair, minimal, and failure. To a great extent, scoring is a mechanical matter, but in our field it often requires a high degree of linguistic skill to evaluate responses in the proper way. We should look upon grading, I think, as another operation, calling not only for technical skill but also for professional judgment. Grading permits the teacher to relate the performance on a test to the total progress that a class is making, to relate the work of an individual student to what he has previously done and what other members of the class are doing, to decide whether a given mark may have an effect that is positive or negative or merely neutral, and evaluate accordingly.

Question: How can a teacher improve his skill in the writing of items? Success in item writing is often related to success in inventing new types of items. Many teachers can be greatly helped in this regard by examining a variety of item types, then adapting some of them to their own use or inventing comparable ones for special purposes. The Cooperative Test Division of the Educational Testing Service now has available a 20-30 page document that contains, among other things, an inventory of some 45 item types for language tests. Consulting this inventory is sure to be helpful in composing items of one's own. Information about it can be obtained by writing to Mr. Donald Melville of the Cooperative Test Division.

Question: What is the best way to score speaking tests? Having gotten our student to say a few things in the target language, either by means of repetition, reading from a text, answering questions, or looking at pictures, how do we give a score for what he produces? I recommend that we consider five different points for each response he makes, remembering that a response may be as little as a single utterance or as much as a succession of sentences. Suppose we establish an evaluation table in four sections: good, fair, poor, unacceptable. A response can be scored according to one of these values on the following five points: first, are the individual sounds, the vowels and the consonants, accurate or not? second, are the intonation patterns, the ups and downs and dynamics satisfactory or not? third, is the response given so promptly that there is clearly no reference to English? fourth, is the response grammatically acceptable in terms of word order, agreements, and the like? and fifth, how much does the response sound like that of a native speaker? Evaluations of this kind are not easy, but they are something we can learn to do with practice.

Question: How shall we test for literature? Here we must be very modest in our expectations and never overlook the fact that our courses are essentially courses in language. But there is a place in the latter part of the second phase and in the third phase for questions that relate to the content and form of a literary text. We should make soundings, I think, by carefully controlled degrees, asking first for no more than what the text says. Both objective and subjective items can be devised that will reveal how fully and how accurately a text has been read. Multiple choice items, completion items, and single sentence answers will serve us well in this kind of measurement. Next it is probably best to aim at the dynamics of presentation. We will be concerned with genre, length, beginnings, endings, introduction and development of main idea, climax, and resolution. Here, of course, we will use mostly the subjective type of question. Thirdly, we may ask about purpose, about between-the-lines significance, about reader reaction to what the author presents. Last of all--because so much more maturity is required--we may ask about style and about idiomatic and artistic use of language. Time and again we will have better results with such tests if the teacher has given models beforehand of ways in which these different questions are to be answered.

I have saved my most difficult question for the last: How shall we test for culture? I think it is already clear from what I have said that we cannot test until we know what it is we wish to teach. And the teaching of culture has not yet reached a point that permits us to be very complete or precise. But as I have tried to indicate some ways in which culture may be taught, it is only fair for me to attempt to show, at least with a few examples, how it may be tested.

Here again we must be specific about levels. In the first phase, I propose, for one thing, the use of the pragmatic item. Let me demonstrate what I mean.

I am using pragmatic as opposed to semantic, that is, what words mean in a given situation as opposed to what they mean on the pages of a dictionary. Suppose we have an item in which two 14-year olds are talking together. One of them says: "How ald are *you*?" In a 3-choice item we might propose as answers: "Yesterday", "Fourteen", and "Half past two". We would call this a semantic item because the first and third choices are meaningless as responses to the question. But here is a pragmatic item. Again, our 14-year olds are conversing and one says: "Here's a quarter you dropped." The choices for a rejoinder are: "How very kind of you." "Gee, thanks." and "I'm deeply grateful." All these responses are meaningful as replies, but only one is culturally appropriate. I have not developed this kind of item very far, but I have hopes for it. It could be very useful in the first phase.

Another type of culture item is possible when our learners are more advanced. This we may call the footnote item. In its simpler form we would provide the student with a block of text and ask him to indicate what words or expressions require, not a grammatical or a semantic footnote, but a cultural footnote. We could credit him according to his ability to select the sensitive items. To help make this clear, I can suggest a few words that might occur in a French text and that would require a cultural footnote: *esprit*, *concierge*, *embrasser*, *chahuter*, *tu*, *salon*, *chez soi*, *guignol*. To make an item of this kind more difficult the text may show words of this type already selected, to which the student is asked to supply pertinent cultural information. It appears likely that this kind of item will be very useful in the second phase.

Moving on to the third phase, we can assume that our student is by now well acquainted with the distinctions to be made between culture as art, culture as daily living, and culture as a total way of life. In the first, we can ask him direct questions about famous persons, famous works of literature, of art and music, about the role of art in community life in towns and cities. In the second, under manifest culture (always remembering the personal factor) we can ask him about chronological milestones, about celebrating holidays, about success in studies, winning prizes, and earning an income. In deep culture we can ask him to describe the family table, the playground, going to church, to write about patriotism, about fair play, and attitudes toward language and toward people from other countries. In culture as a totality we can expect the student to reproduce facts about geography, history, and civilization, and perhaps even more important to show that he understands what a culture is and how it can be studied and described. Before we can expect to be successful with culture tests of this kind we shall have to prepare materials for teaching these matters--and in so doing learn a great deal ourselves. But I believe that this is a professional task from which we cannot turn aside.

I find that I do have one more question: How is the speaker to bring all this to a close? I will do so by offering three very brief reminders for test-makers: a) respect the importance of testing, b) make tests for the learner, and c) look upon testing as a source of increased motivation for learning.

ART AND MECHANICS IN FL INSTRUCTION*

Lansing, 27 Oct., 1967

Nelson Brooks, Yale University

In this conference we are concerned with humanities in the foreign language classroom. We should, to begin with, be clear about what kind of classroom we refer to and what we mean by the humanities.

I need not review, with this audience, the changes that have taken place in the last decade and a half in the foreign language classes in our schools and colleges. But a reminder of the principal difference between then and now will serve to make more understandable the main ideas I wish to present. Formerly we gave courses that reflected, in the main, a philological approach to language. We compared the structures of two languages, we plunged immediately into the analysis and interpretation of a text, and we remained engrossed in the transformation of written forms in one language into the written forms of another. Today, while retaining full respect for the philological aspect of language and incorporating it even more seriously into our work, we preface and accompany this experience with sustained activities in language as communication. There is far more to language than communication, but in the past the exchange of meaning through spoken discourse was simply left out. We are now, with no little success, filling that void. Our classroom, then, is one in which both philology and communication are prime concerns.

There was a time when the term "humanities" was used to identify studies that were not theological, but were centered rather on man himself. Today this use of the word has given way to another opposition, this time between the arts and the sciences. There are sound philosophical reasons for this distinction, as is shown in this statement by George Santayana: "Science is the response to the demand for information, and in it we ask for the truth and nothing but the truth. Art is the response to the demand for entertainment, for the stimulation of our senses and imagination, and truth enters into it only as it subserves these ends." As long as our purpose in the classroom was philological, and that only, the word humanities could have a certain very important but somewhat limited application. Now that we include the use of language by the learner, the meaning of the word humanities has to be expanded and refined.

---

* A talk given at a meeting of the Michigan Foreign Language Association, Mich. State University, October 27, 1967.

Our general theme, "The Humanities in the Language Classroom" may therefore be restated as "Art or Nonscience and group instruction in the philological and communication aspects of language." This may seem rather cumbersome, as definitions inevitably are, but as workers in language we should go as far as we can in stating clearly what it is we are talking about. Our emphasis upon nonscience has in it no disregard for the value of science, which, on the contrary, we fully respect. To quote George Santayana again, "Intuition runs equally into truth and error, and can settle nothing if not controlled by experience." It is by exploring both science and art that we shall find the best answers to our problems of language instruction. The core idea of art is the act of putting things together, of joining things--hence the somewhat hidden relationship to articulation. Art is therefore a synthesis. In esthetic terms, it is creative. In physical terms, it is negative entropy--entropy being the tendency of created things to go from order to disorder, an inevitable drift toward chaos that is demonstrated in the second law of thermodynamics. This retreat toward chaos is the easier path, and it is always available to us. Sometimes we may even profit by following the path for a while, for a better scale of personal values may result when differences become sufficiently great. No doubt the hippies will one day be better men as a result of their present exercise in regression.

In a way, they have Descartes on their side, for he wrote: "To attain truth, it is necessary once in one's life to get rid of all ready-made opinions and construct anew, from the very bottom, all systems of knowledge." I do not find in this advice of Descartes any mandate to avoid the barber and bathtub, but I do read in it a clear call to language teachers to do some thinking on their own.

We are sometimes asked by humanistic scholars to assume that language and literature are the same thing, that spoken language is"an impoverished shorthand we put into circulation for immediate practical purposes." We are asked to diminish the drudgery of learning the basic sounds and forms and phrase structure of the new tongue by coming without delay to that refinement of language in textual form we call literature. I wish to demonstrate, and I hope, to prove, not that this aim is undesirable but that it is, quite simply, impossible. I propose to do this by examining in some detail what the words art and mechanics may mean in the conduct of our language classes.

The word art refers not only to the mere act of putting things together, it refers also to the manner of doing so. In assembling various elements into an integrated whole, we may be clumsy or adroit, we may be lavish or economical, we may be haphazard or precise. The result of our efforts may be appealing or bizarre, it may be ugly or it may be beautiful. These comments suffice, I think, to remind us that the word art can lead us to the neatness and efficiency of pragmatics and also to the sensibilities and subtleties of esthetics. To give the word mechanics its due, we must trace it all the way back to a Doric Greek word meaning a pulley, thence to a word in both Greek and Latin meaning a contrivance of any kind. With the development of the science of physics since the Renaissance, the principles of mechanics seemed to relate very well to our present century. For a time it seemed as if these were exceptions, but then came the elaboration of wave mechanics and quantum theory that seems to have resolved any basic conflict. Physical laws, such as the attraction of gravity or the transfer of motion all appear to work on mechanical principles, the main character of which is, for our purposes, that they always work the same way. If you drop your watch, it falls down, not up, every time. When one billiard ball hits another, the second one moves and the first slows down, again every time. Our meaning of the word mechanics is not quite as rigid as this, but in our work we must deal with what is stable, limited, and predictable on the one hand and what is random, free, and inventive on the other. If you toss a tennis ball across a lawn it may well end up in the garden on the other side. If you toss a living butterfly across a lawn it, too, may end up in the garden on the other side. The paths they follow, however, will be very different. This ball-and-butterfly contrast is what I really mean by the distinction between mechanics and art.

Are there really basic principles of language, of language users, and of classroom procedure so regularized and consistent that we can employ the word mechanics to describe them? There are indeed. Do not waste time looking for an English word that begins with the sound of 'zh.' This sound is common enough within words in English, but you will not find it in the intital position, ever. If you wish to produce the sound 'u' in French, your mouth and lips must assume a certain conformation or you will not succeed. And this is true every time. In teaching, do not expect the same outcome if you name your student first and then ask your question as will result if you ask your question first and then name your student; the norms of group response are all against you. At the same time, can we find in language, in language users, and in classroom instruction the principles of freedom, of inventiveness, of refinement and esthetic preference that enable us to use the term art? Again, we can indeed, as subsequent paragraphs will show. But one basic conclusion must be stated first of all. Mechanics is the groundwork upon which all is based. It supports art, but at the same time is not dependent upon it. We cannot say the same of art. Art does depend upon mechanics, for mechanics marks the limits within which art can function. Many a competent user of language never wrote a sonnet, but no sonnet was ever written by other than a competent user of language. In a word, mechanics can do without art, but art cannot do without mechanics.

Now that we are reasonably clear about what we mean by art and mechanics for our present purposes, we need next to show how they relate to each other in the classroom and to note some areas in each category that merit our special attention. In his new, arresting, and difficult book entitled Cartesian Linguistics Noam Chomsky borrows two terms from contemporary American Linguistics: 'deep' and 'surface' grammar. We have, he says, been too concerned with surface grammar, and have ignored the greater challenge of deep grammar. To meet this challenge we must deal with what are called the cognitive processes--a tall order for those psychologists and linguists who have for some decades equated mentalism with idiocy. But as Chomsky suggests, the philosophers and linguists of earlier centuries can hardly have been so wrong as all that. By facing up to the problems of cognition, we may find ourselves working at much closer range with those creative and generative processes that we refer to in our word art. Where are we to find the dividing line that marks off art within mechanics? For want of a better answer, I suggest that we shall find it in the area in which inert matter takes on those qualities of animation that we call life. Inert matter, of course, is well endowed with movement, with expansion and contraction, with explosions and diffusions, with attraction and repulsion, and the most astounding ranges of energy and scope from the infinitesimal to the universal. But these are not the characteristics that we attribute to what we call life. Just what these are is described with elegance and conviction by one of the world's great physicists, Erwin Schroedinger, in a slim volume of some 80 pages entitled What Is Life?, written in 1943. His study concentrates on the dividing line between the animate and the inanimate. Suppose in a lively mass of disparate atoms a complicated pattern or formation lines itself up and distinguishes itself from its surroundings as, to simplify, the big dipper stands out against the background of the heavens. Suppose also that this complicated entity turns out to have three hitherto unassigned characteristics. First, it can maintain itself in this sea of constant change; second, it can replicate itself, and can produce copies of itself in great numbers; and thirdly, it is susceptible to minor alterations that lead to slight and eventually marked differences in these resulting copies. You can see right away the relationship between this set of ideas as set forth by Schroedinger and Darwin's Origin of Species.

What we are looking for is where creativity and originality and generative power come in. We have not located this area precisely, of course, but I believe what I have just said gives strong indications of where we will find it and where we will not. And if you think my purpose in these comments is to establish a contrast, a polarity, with a living, breathing, bright-eyed teacher at one end and a tape recorder and play-back mechanism at the other, you are absolutely right. The tape recorder can manage the mechanics of language use quite well, and we are fortunate that it can, but it lacks the blood chemistry to engage even in the smallest degree in the art of language use. Like the tennis ball, its course is entirely determined by the forces that play upon it. It cannot, like the butterfly, modify the effect of those forces or initiate a language act on its own.

Once we recognize what the mechanics of language must be, we can see all the more clearly how and where the creative principle functions. We can agree with Noam Chomsky when he paraphrases, in 1966, what Susanne Langer said in 1942--and here are Chomsky's words "Human language is free from stimulus control. It does not serve a merely communicative function but is rather an instrument for the free expression of thought and for appropriate response to new situations."

If we say that the user of a language is free to create language, just how does this creativity express itself? Obviously the speaker cannot add new phonemes to the language, nor can he, with the rarest exceptions, add any words to the language. He cannot invent new patterns of word order, new endings to mark agreements, or new patterns of phrase structure. It is not until we come to the sentence that the user of language is finally free to exercise the creative principle that makes language so valuable to us for daily use and for artistic creation. But please note that in saying this we have removed from the possibility of innovation all the phonology, all the morphology, nearly all the vocabulary, and nearly all the syntax. These, then, must be assigned to the mechanics of language, something that must be met and mastered on its own terms. Only when this has been done can creativity begin to function in the realm of sentence structure. It is obvious that literature can present the elements of language only in a random way. But any course in formal instruction demands an order of encounter and a completeness of coverage that literature, by its very nature, cannot possibly provide. Those who ask for the immediate full freedom of art for beginners in the area of mechanics are quite obviously those who never had the task of piloting a classroom full of learners through the long and difficult journey that ends in the individual control of these mechanical details in the new language.

May I now draw together, in a schematic way, what we may say about the presence of mechanics and of art in the three areas we have identified: language itself, users of language, and classroom instruction.

The mechanics of language are well analyzed and described by the scientists of language, the linguists. To them we owe--a debt we gratefully recognize--a host of remarkable insights into language as a system, insights that were not clarified until the vigorous light of science was turned upon it. In a sense, language is all mechanics until a speaker puts it to use. And even when put to use, language can still remain purely mechanical, as in the quite unimpeachable sentence: "Voila la plume de ma tante." But we can observe the effect of mechanics to which art has been added in this sentence from a letter of Emily Dickinson's: "Father steps like Cromwell when he goes for the kindlings." And also in this sentence from one of her poems: "When winds take forests in their paws, The universe is still." We must look for art in the right place. There is no art in a yard of canvas, nor in a paint brush, nor in a tube of burnt umber. The art is in the artist's mind and in his hand. We must conclude that there is no art in language itself, any more than there is animation in our clothes until we put them on.

We come next to language users and how mechanics applies to them. Here we would first review the physiology of the vocal apparatus, of the ear, and of the eye, for they all play a part in the normal use of language. Second, we would review the training the user of language has had in employing these various organs in the service of language. Thirdly, we would review the various modes of language use. These have been brilliantly analyzed by the Russian psychologist, Lev Vygotsky, who proposes a kind of spectrum that may be briefly described as follows: Deep within the individual there is first of all consciousness, then thought, then thought in words, then inner speech. Externally we find spoken monologue, then spoken dialogue, next normal social talk, then the various forms of printed language, and ultimately the fine art of literature. All three of these areas merit extended study, and together they represent quite well the mechanics of language use that the speaker has at his disposal.

Before leaving this section of our subject, let me point out certain differences in the mechanics of the ear and of the eye that so far have not received from language teachers the attention they merit. There is in sound a relationship to temporal qualities that contrasts with the spacial qualities of what we observe through vision. The mechanics of language, therefore, must take into account temporal considerations of a very different order from the mechanics of visual presentation. From the point of view of language instruction, the eye perceives two classes of things: one, the total visual world that surrounds us with its colors, its contrasts, and its perspective, and two, the visual presentation of the sounds of language. Writing brings to the eye certain temporal concerns that are not at all characteristic of everything else the eye observes. Consider how different a process we go through when we look at a picture and when we read a page of print. A visual presentation can convey in a few seconds a great number of details concerning size, shape, color, relationship in a given scene, details that would require many minutes, to say the least, if conveyed by means of language. Both pictures and words have their special advantages. Pictures can particularize far better than words, but words can generalize far better than pictures. A passport picture will do for one person only, but it would take volumes to illustrate all that is meant by the word 'house'. The different nature of our response to pictures, to written words and to spoken words is a vital matter in the mechanics of language use.

There are rules for performance in language and the user must know these rules and work within them. To learn these rules and to conform to them without paying attention, as, for example, making a verb plural when the subject is plural, the adjective feminine when the noun is feminine, is a large order in second language instruction, calling for a vast expenditure of time and effort on the part of all concerned.

Although we may for a time wish our students to stay within the limits of what they are sure is right by using only those sentences that have been modelled for them, this phase is only of brief duration. For the very essence of language symbolism is the initiation of sentences on one's own and reaction to new situations as they arise. The limitations imposed are many, but art consists in moving freely within them. Art and constraint are not incompatible. In fact, artistic effects may gain much in quality as a direct result of limitations put upon art. One has but to think of what the poets have done with the sonnet in many different languages since its invention eight or nine hundred years ago, yet with complete respect for the fixity of its form.

Now that we have come to the art of language use, we find ourselves in the area which has the strongest appeal for the humanist. Here we can speak of the language user's ability to combine in novel ways of his own the various elements of language with which he has been provided. Our butterfly is now in full flight. We can delight in his free play of imagination and originality and in his self-directed manipulation of the various language skills. He must not go beyond the border into error but as long as he respects the mechanics of language and of language use there is quite literally no limit to what he may construct and express, regardless of the models that may or may not have been set before him. You will listen to many reels of recorded speech and search through many volumes of printed prose before you find a fully adequate model for the splendid English sentence: "Happiness is a warm puppy."

We could speak at length about the matters listed under the mechanics and the art of language use. There is of course no time for this, but I am reluctant to go on without mentioning something that I think has been largely overlooked in this regard. My favorite term for what I have in mind is 'dyadic', the interplay of two reacting as one. This was noted in our reference to spoken dialogue as one of the mechanisms of language use. The give-and-take of language utterance is, by far the commonest use of spoken speech. It can be as banal as a soap opera, yet in its rarefied form it has been referred to as "feast of wit and flow of soul." It is through the dyadic of language that we learn it in the first place, that we practice it most of all, and that we enjoy it so much when properly done. It seems to me regrettable that we have, up to now, given so little thought to this linguistic interplay of two considered as one.

It is at this point, art in language use, that we come closest to the general topic of our conference: The Humanities in the Classroom. We should pause to see how the two topics interrelate. Remembering that by the term humanities we mean the classical tradition, literature, history, the fine arts, the cultural heritage of the finest deeds and thoughts and things that a nation has produced, what part can these play in our language classrooms? For them to play any significant role at all, there would appear to be two requirements that are absolute. One is that the humanities as such cannot be introduced until the learner is well beyond the completion of a basic course, the other is that he must have become accustomed to the sustained use of the target language in the classroom. Not that a readiness, a potential for humanistic studies cannot be built up from the very beginning of the language course. They can indeed. But for this potential to become a reality, a considerable competence in language control must first have been developed. We have not contributed very much that we can call humanism to our learner's knowledge if he knows only proper sounds and intonations in a new language, only verb forms and sentence patterns, only the various skills, only lists of vacabulary and idioms. Humanistic values come into play in second language learning when the student can begin to savor in its own terms, without the intrusion of his mother tongue, a page of Proust, a sonnet of Baudelaire, a passage from Don Quixote, or a lyric by Heinrich Heine. One must have enough acquaintance with the way of life in another country to comprehend and evaluate such statements as these: The French are in love with their language, The Spanish-speaking people are in love with friendship, the Germans are in love with song.

Finally we come to mechanics and art in language instruction. We can summarize the mechanics of instruction under three headings: logistics, dynamics, and techniques. In ligistics we refer to space, dimensions, location, light, air, heat, the menace of noise, and the availability of supplies, from books and tapes to pencils and chalk. Of special importance in the early phase of language instruction are arrangements whereby students may face each other and whereby the teacher may move easily among them from one part of the room to another. By dynamics we mean the active role played by the various parties to group instruction, the speed at which things take place, the volume of the sounds that are produced, the variety of activities engaged in and the logic of progression from one to another in a meaningful pattern of accomplishment. Techniques that can be used in language instruction are of course legion. I will refer to only the briefest sampling of some that may be especially germane to our present discussion, for they can be directly helpful in getting the learner to launch out successfully on his own.

I believe teachers should develop much more than they have the classroom technique of choral speaking. Anyone who has heard the voice of the chorus in a Greek drama, or indeed who has listened to the sopranos in the Ninth Symphony or the basses in the B-minor Mass, must realize what is potentially possible when a group of persons are trained to produce language in unison. Of course as children we all learn to mumble in slow monotone in responsive readings in church. But it is quite possible for twenty or thirty people to speak a sentence with the speed and the intonation of a single voice. Any teacher who is willing to try to achieve this will find the result both surprising and rewarding. The repetition of sentences and the memorization of dialogues must not be brushed aside as inconsequential in developing the ability to be creative in the new language. Jerome Bruner in his introduction to Lev Vygotsky's book Thought and Language writes as follows: "It is the internalization of overt action that makes thought, and particularly the internalization of external dialogue that brings the powerful tool of language to bear on the stream of thought."

I believe also that our students need instruction not only in performing the active skills but also the passive. I have purposely used the words active and passive because you will know that I mean by active, speaking and writing, and by passive, listening and reading. In fact, however, these adjectives are quite inadequate, as I think you will agree if we talk for a moment about coaching our students in the art of listening and the art of reading.

We can all listen passively. Have you not, at times, found yourself subjected to a stream of allophones, and suddenly realized, after a time, that you have not comprehended a word of what has just been said? This, I think, we could well call passive listening. Have you not sometimes found yourself reading a text, following it well enough up to a point, then suddenly coming to the end of a paragraph with the realization that you have comprehended nothing of what it contained? This, too, we could call passive reading. All one can do is go over the text again, and this time make it mean something. If it finally does, you have a right to ask just what the difference was between these two experiences. To aid us in understanding what happens when we receive language--and you will see why I suggest we do away with the words passive and active and substitute receptive and productive--we may turn to an analysis and description of listening given by George Miller in an article written some three years ago. He indicates that at the simplest level we merely hear an utterance, being able to tell, if nothing else, how long it lasted, how loud it was, how fast it was spoken, and from what direction it came. Next, we match what we hear with elements of a phonological skill we already possess, a step that can be tested by the mere repetition of what was heard. Thirdly, we accept the statement, or reject it, as belonging to a given language. Beyond this, we must interpret the sentence, which involves fitting together the various meaning elements in a way that coincides with the semantic patterns of the language in question. Still further, we must understand the statement. All the foregoing may be in good order and still understanding will not follow. I sometimes say to a friend in conversation: "In America we eat our children." The result is, without fail, a look of non-comprehension, until I paraphrase by saying that we exploit them ruthlessly for financial profit.

Understanding follows immediately. Miller describes a final level which he calls belief. The example I just gave will serve again, for one can understand what I mean by my statement that we eat our children, and still not believe it. This analysis is, I think, extremely useful in helping us understand how much inner activity is involved in successful listening. We could, without difficulty, set up a comparable pattern of activity for reading.

Now a few comments about art in language instruction. Of the many qualities associated with the term 'art' I have chosen four as the most significant for our purpose. They are these: design, interest, variety, and depth. By design I mean that the class hour is not a random sequence of happenings but follows a plan that has been sketched in advance. By interest I mean what attracts and holds the attention of the learners--something that is in general, roughly measurable by the direction of their eyes and the lack of body movements and noise. By variety I mean the change of activity and pace, not simple discontinuity but a modification that relates to what has gone before and what is to follow. By depth I mean the degree of integration that takes place in a learner's brain cells when something is learned, and the awareness, on the part of the learner, that this has happened. The teacher's task differs from that of a doctor, who cures diseases, from that of a lawyer, who settles disputes, and from that of an inventor who puts mechanisms together in ingenious and novel ways. The teacher works with growing minds--minds that are going to grow anyway, but whose growth may be deeply affected by the teacher's artistry. I know of no set of language materials, no group of students, no classroom circumstance in which the art of teaching, either by its presence or its absence, is not revealed as the one priceless ingredient without which the whole notion of formal instruction is hardly worth the effort it requires.

There may be some who are surprised that I have not talked about electronics in the form of machines that record and reproduce the sounds of human speech. A complete development of our topic would certainly lead us in this direction. But a full treatment of electronics would also lead us to neurophysiology, for the free-moving electron that is the basic element of an electric current is a creature of the cerebral cortex as well as of the latest product of Sony or Scott or K L H. For us to pursue this important and fascinating subject there simply is not time.

I have therefore stayed within the area of the basic difference between the mechanical and the artistic in the global sense, trying to separate the mechanical from the inventive, the creative, the purely human freedom not only to manipulate--which our machines can often do better than we can--but beyond this to initiate, to originate, which is an exclusively human prerogative. Language is the most obvious, the most ubiquitous proof of what it is to be human in an animate, animal world. For myself, I like gadgets as well as anyone, but this does not blind me to the limitations of what human minds and fingers can contrive. Make no mistake about it, language is in the genes, and it appears that our destiny is not to create our genetic inheritance, but to live it.

THE ROLE OF SECONDARY EDUCATION IN FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING*

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

To get our teeth into this subject, we may begin by asking two questions: Just what is secondary education? and Just what is language learning? For this discussion I have taken secondary education to mean what happens to learners between the beginning of the seventh grade and the end of the twelfth. This six-year span would not match up with the concept of the secondary school everywhere, but I believe it applies well enough here in central Massachusetts.

If the answer to the first question is relatively easy, the answer to the question What is language learning? is difficult in the extreme. In the most general terms, foreign language learning rests on the simple fact that there are many people in the world who speak and write languages other than English. This is true of the present, it was also true of the past. Knowing another man's language is both to the advantage of the individual and in the national interest. This statement could be elaborated at length, but I take it for granted that we would not disagree. This statement is critical, however, for it summarized the justification for the inclusion of foreign languages in the curriculum of our schools.

A question I have been asking myself of late is this: What _is_ a language course? If we can devise a suitable answer, we can then get to the main thrust of our assignment, the role of secondary education in such a course. The word 'course' implies decisions about pupils, about teachers, about curriculum content. Such decisions cannot be wisely made without preliminary clarification as to what the approach to the subject is to be.

---

* A talk given at a meeting of the Worcester County (Mass.) Teachers' Association, November 3, 1967.

We should remember that the same set of phenomena can be studied for quite different reasons. The stars were once diligently studied in order to find out what was going to happen to us tomorrow. This approach to events in the heavens has now largely given way to a study of the stars themselves.

There are two principal approaches to learning another language at the secondary level. One of these has been widely practiced in the United States for nearly a century. The other has been attempted on a large scale for rather less than a decade. We shall have to be clear about what these two approaches are and the differences between them before we can answer our question What is a language course?

It is often true that we see our problems in language and their answers more clearly if we turn to music. Let us see if such an analogy can help us here. Suppose we wish to study a given piece of music. To be specific, let us choose a Haydn symphony. One approach would be to read about Haydn, about his great productivity in musical composition, about the symphonic form and how Haydn used it to express his musical ideas. We would select a given symphony and study it from the point of view of harmony and counterpoint, listen to an analysis of its themes and their development in the four movements of the symphony, listen also to excerpts from the piece and hear them discussed by a knowledgeable musicologist. Finally we would listen to the symphony in its entirety, its musical message now greatly enriched by this methodical and thoroughly pleasurable preparation for perceptive listening. This approach to a Haydn symphony is of the highest order, and is as recommendable as anything that a formal curriculum can offer.

There is another approach to a Haydn symphony. This approach takes longer and is considerably more difficult, but it has in it certain experiences and rewards not offered by the first approach. The critical difference between the two is simple but radical. It is summed up in the word 'participation'. We first teach our learner the rudiments of violin playing. We give him finger exercises and bowing exercises, scales major and minor and arpeggi, and fingering in the various positions. We teach him to read musical notation and to play with respect for pitch, rhythm, and tone. He can now take his place with the second violins on the stage as the orchestra performs this symphony of Haydn. His experience of the music is one not shared by those who sit in the audience and observe. The performer must relate to the director, to the other players, and to the message of the music with a degree of personal involvement that is not felt by those who only listen. Please note that both these approaches are highly recommendable. They are simply different, and there is no reason at all why the same learner cannot have an experience of both. A possible rejoinder to what I have been saying might well be that we cannot teach music to everybody. But let me reply that in language, everybody already knows how to play one instrument. The task is to learn to play another. We usually find analogies useful only up to a certain point. But I hope that this one has illustrated to some extent the difference between observation and analysis on the one hand and, on the other, direct personal participation.

In order to answer the question What is a language course? there is no need to outline what is included in the first or philological approach, for it is well known to all. If such a course is well done it commands respect and it will produce results that are highly esteemed in the academic world, and rightly so. Let us attempt an answer in terms of the other approach, the communication or participation approach. In this we find much that is new, much that was never included in a language course, except in a limited number of schools and colleges, until quite recently. A language course of this kind has a triple objective, and runs through three successive and different phases. It takes a long time, for most learners five or six years at a minimum. For the sake of clarity we should remember that we are speaking not of what can happen in the home, not of what can happen in the foreign country in which the target language is spoken, not of the learner who already knows a language in addition to his mother tongue. We are speaking of a monolingual whose native language is English and whose experience of a new language takes place while he is a learner in classrooms in the United States. The three objectives for such a learner can be noted as language competence, cultural information and insight, and literary acquaintance. The three phases through which he passes we may call basic course, language competence, and advanced study in culture and literature. Each of these phases usually lasts a minimum of two years. At the end of this six-year span we have a learner who is quite at home in the target language when he hears it and reads it, and who can perform in the new language, at least acceptably, when called upon to speak it or to write it. He has probed with interest and sympathy into the daily life and thought of those who speak this language and he has an intimate acquaintance with at least some carefully selected and representatives samples of its literature.

If we can agree, at least for the moment, that this is what we mean by a language course, we can then proceed to examine the role of the secondary school in this sequence of learning. This role is not singular but plural. In fact the high school is called upon to play many parts. It must initiate the course for many learners, but for some its task is not to initiate but to continue what has already been started. Again, it must provide a terminal course for many learners, while for others it must establish a foundation that will be built upon when the learner continues his language study in college. We thus find that our topic is multiplied by a factor of four. What are secondary schools to do for those who are beginning their language course? what for those who have already begun? what for those who will not continue after secondary school? and what for those will go on to higher institutions?

To consider first the broader aspects of the role of secondary education, the upper school needs to know with precision and detail what has been taught in the elementary school, and it needs to know for each individual student how successful the learning has been. The upper school curriculum for such learners must match up with and build upon what has been learned in the lower school. This is no small order, and it implies much cooperative effort on curriculum content, on materials, and on tests, not to mention fundamental agreement on overall objectives.

Looking beyond the school to the college, we find a comparable need for schools and colleges to confer and agree on the nature of what is to be learned in order that the student in college may feel that his language course is indeed a continuity, that what he learned in school relates directly and positively to what is now asked of him in college. This again calls for a cooperative professional effort and a continuing exchange of information, points of view, and data on the progress of individual students.

What should the secondary school do for those who begin their language course in the seventh grade or perhaps later? What should it do about those who abandon the course before it is completed? What should it do for those not bound for college, for whom the course is terminal? These are hard questions, for most students do begin their language course in the secondary school, a great many students do abandon the language course before it is completed, and as we know nearly half of our high school population carries formal education no further.

A basic fact in all these questions is that foreign language is for the most part not a required course in the school itself. Occasionally we find a language requirement for exit from secondary school but not often. It is probably better this way, yet we should remember that the intellectual content of a language course is quite on a par with courses in English or history or mathematics, which are required. Colleges, however, in general do have a language requirement for entrance and often a further requirement for exit--a fact of profound importance for all of us, and for the schools in particular, for it is the keystone of our total professional effort.

Are there certain basic considerations that the secondary schools should have in mind as they deal with these various types of needs? It appears that there are, and I should like to list a few and make some remarks about them. Thus far in our discussion we have considered secondary education and language learning in broad perspective. I propose now to move up nearer to the tapestry we are viewing in order to scrutinize at closer range what we may call key areas or critical points, basic concerns and problems, even dilemmas, worrisome matters not at all difficult to identify if we look about us with a keen ear and a sharp eye.

Here then are some questions that I think we would all like an answer to. Without presuming to provide the answers, I would like to comment on the questions, remembering that whatever we say should be germane to the needs of students in grades seven to twelve. My first question is this: How are students to be selected for the foreign language course? Every student who gets as far as our classrooms has already demonstrated his ability to handle language, or he would not be at large in human society. The ability to handle a second language is by no means so generally possessed, especially when it is to be learned in that rather special circumstance we call formal education. Neither the general IQ nor success in other subjects can be taken as a dependable index of success in foreign language study. Some prognostic tests have been devised, and these work reasonably well, though they tend to have one serious drawback. While the students to whom these tests say "Yes" are very likely to develop into successful language learners, some of those to whom they say "No" may also turn out to be good language learners. We must be careful to protect not only the teacher and the course but also the student.

Another means of selection is to let the student take the course for a while, then permit him to drop out if he can't make it. This is, in fact, our most general practice. The high rate of attrition at the end of the first year is no doubt related to our inability to identify before they start those who will succeed and those who won't. If it could be done, it might be better to dismiss the unsuccessful at the end of the first semester, then to insist more firmly than we have that those who show good promise should continue at least until they have gained a knowledge we can call language competence.

A second question: How does the secondary school deal with the products of the elementary grades? This problem has been with us for some time and it increases in its insistence each year. A few facts can be put in evidence that may suggest a better continuity. Current studies in the psychobiology of language make it clear that certain aspects of language behavior are best learned when we are children. Great care must be exercised at the secondary level to preserve the special quality of language control acquired by those who start early. By such learners, the basic course will have been begun in the elementary school and will therefore have to be completed in the junior high school. It is a professional responsibility of great moment to see to it that these two parts fit together into an integrated whole. One all-important recommendation is this: the products of FLES should never be mixed with beginners in grade seven.

Another question: What is the best time schedule for language classes? From the learner's point of view there can be little doubt that a daily session not too long, is best during the basic course. In the subsequent phases, classes can be rather longer, but even then the daily session is still preferred for an ideal program.

Question: What is to be done about the choice of materials? There are now available for secondary schools many sets of materials that can be counted upon to produce good results. What is not only important but mandatory is that the student should follow the same set of materials at least until he has finished the basic course; anything less is a gross professional error that is inexcusable. As teachers, we often have personal preferences for one set of materials over another. But on this subject I should like to be very frank, even severe. The welfare of the learner must not be sacrificed on the altar of teacher intransigence. There was a time not too long ago when satisfactory materials were not generally available. Now they are, in quantity and variety. Inquiries should be made, and decisions should be arrived at and abided by, so that the student is not taken half way through the basic course with one set of materials and then switched to another set for the completion of the basic course. This can only result in a mismatch as awkward as that grotesque animal we sometimes hear of that is half donkey and half elephant--a Republocrat!

Question: What is the role of tests and measurements at the secondary level? Its importance is far greater, I suspect, than we have as yet realized. Prognostic tests for choosing those who may take the course, progress tests to measure growth at regular intervals, placement tests that will help locate the student in the proper class when he moves from one grade to another or from one school to another, all these need to be far more carefully prepared and more widely and wisely used than at present. Tests for achievement at the end of the basic course and at the end of the second phase are in relatively good shape, for as a profession we have, with federal support, been able to produce very good measurement instruments of this sort. But the test program conceived of as a regulatory factor in a course, so designed and executed that it is a positive stimulus to learning, is still something for us to develop far beyond its present stage.

Question: How are the programs in the junior and the senior high schools to be integrated? The question implies that they are separated, and indeed they usually are, and not only by geographical distance. As the years go by, we realize more and more that the notion of a junior high school was a mistake. But we must still live with it. There are several ingredients that are required for a successful interrelationship between the junior and the senior high school concerning language learning. One is a basic agreement by teachers of both types of schools on objectives and methodology. Another is agreement on the selection of textual material. A third is cooperation on a measurement program, especially to aid the transition from the lower to the upper school.

Question: What has the language course to offer the student not bound for college? One answer is a course with a major difference in curriculum content from what is offered to the college-bound. This may well take the form of less insistence upon language in printed or written form and less emphasis upon the analysis of structure; instead, greater attention to spoken language and to cultural content, giving culture the new meaning it is now coming to have.

Since I have mentioned the word culture, it may be useful to outline the new meaning of this term as it is at present being elaborated, not only for the benefit of students who are not college-bound but for the entire language program in school and college alike. The word culture is a grossly overburdened word in English, already doing the work of four or five words. It is surely one that merits to be "paid extra". As workers in language we need to sort out these different meanings and give each one its due. Otherwise we shall be continually using pennies for dimes and nickels for quarters in an irritating fog of confusion. In briefest terms, we may say that there is an area of 'culture', meaning the best of artistic creations, of literature, music, architecture, of noble thoughts and deeds--that is, the humanist's concept of culture. There is another area meaning a total way of life as the scientist conceives of it, an honest and perceptive inclusion of everything that is thought or done, in which, as you may guess, there is surprise and shock and ugliness as well as bravery and love and beauty. Between these two areas there is a third which we must also call culture. This middle area is really nothing more nor less than the patterns of daily living. Each of us meets life moment by moment, hour by hour, and day by day, in a series of situations usually quite banal but occasionally exciting and dramatic. These situations are well supplied with patterns of expectancy as to what our role in them should be. What are we supposed to think, to wear, to do, to say, to eat, to laugh at, to take off our hats to, and the like? Our lesser thoughts and acts are culture too.

Whether or not we conform to the expectation is our business; in general we are better off if we do conform. The price we may pay if we do not is precisely the point of the novel l'Étranger by Albert Camus, in which the main character paid with his head for smoking a cigarette, drinking coffee, and going to the movies at the wrong time and for not shedding tears at the right time. On the other hand, if everybody always conformed to the expected pattern we should be living the life of the ants. This interplay between the models for life situations and the individual's conformity to them is something that happens in other countries too. It turns out that when we pursue language study beyond its sounds, its forms, and its syntax, beyond its grammar and its vocabulary, and trace the meaning of the new language to the locus of its use by those who speak it, we find ourselves in the area which I have been describing. The relationship of culture in this sense to the language course is only too obvious. In fact, it is only fair to say that we have not taught language if this is left out. It is and will be the privilege of secondary education to work very closely with the development of this fresh concept.

My final question is: What is the role of literature in secondary school language classes? This question presupposes that we know what literature is and that we always know whether or not a certain piece of writing may be so classified. Well, of course we don't. But we could easily agree on the naming of many works that are literature, as well as others that are not. Our problem is rather to know what works to choose, when to introduce them, and how to treat them. It seems to me that in the longitudinal dimension of our total field we have two kinds of courses, language courses and literature courses. In the former, language is the dominant concern, in the latter, literature. Yet the beginning of an experience with literature is an important ingredient in the second and third phases of the language course. We sometimes hear it said that the schools should teach language, reserving for the college the teaching of literature. In the main, I believe this position is quite tenable, if for no other reason than that the mere fact of maturity is a major element in a literary experience. But this should not be taken to mean that no literary works are to be read in the language course. On the contrary, the reading of a good piece of literature can provide a much needed stimulus to student interest. The point is that the work should not be approached as it would be in a literary course. It is read for the story it tells and for the language it examplifies.

We could of course continue with many more questions of this kind. Instead, let us again assume the point of view of our earlier comments and consider, in conclusion, the role of the secondary school in the total perspective of foreign language learning. In the light of what we know about the acquisition of another language--and this is meager enough--in view of our resources and our facilities, meaning staff, materials, and curriculum time, there is at present, as far as I can see, no better answer to our national need nor to our students' needs than to continue to strengthen our secondary school language programs. Other and better ways may eventually be found to acquaint the learner with the ethos of the planet he lives on, and the predicament of the human family of which he is a part. But you and I have classes to meet next Monday morning and our students' needs are now. My plea would be that we continue to relate the daily tasks we set, in our minds and in theirs, to the larger issue of understanding what it is to be a human being. Surely a knowledge of language and of the meaning of language cannot be omitted in that persistent quest.

TEACHING CULTURE IN THE LANGUAGE CLASS*

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

Three questions will serve as directional signs for the thoughts I wish to share with you. One is: What is culture? The second: How can we teach it? And the third: How can we measure what we have taught? It is not my intention merely to repeat what I said in a recent article in the Foreign Language Annals under a similar title, but I shall make some references to that article for it contains some concepts we shall want to discuss.

Before we can make any real progress in the teaching of culture we must have in our minds a clear idea of what the word culture means. An exercise in definition is always useful in technical discussions. When the subject is culture, definitions are mandatory. We often say that our three objectives are language, culture, and literature. What we mean by language is now generally agreed upon. What we mean by literature is also relatively clear. What we mean by culture, however, is not clear at all. By this word culture, you may mean ballet dancing, I may mean the number that usually occurs--but not always--between 12 and 14, and our neighbor may mean what it is that makes a Tasmanian tick. Of course you and I can hardly attempt to define the word culture in all its meanings for all who make use of it. Even a brief inspection of the 400 page book by A. L. Kroeber and Clude Kluckhohn entitled Culture, a Critical Review of Concepts and Definitions will soon convince us how far beyond our purpose or our capacity such a task would be. However, in this instance, as in many others, it is time, I believe, for language teachers to speak up for themselves. In a field in which confusion is so great and our need so pressing, it seems wholly appropriate for us to state the case in our own terms, realizing quite well the extent to which what we say will be tentative and inadequate.

---

* A talk given at the Northwest Conference on the Teaching of Foreign Languages, Carroll College, Helena, Montana, April 19, 1968.

Our question What is culture? may be expanded a little into: What is it to be in a culture? I am well aware that by adding the indefinite article, saying _a_ culture rather than culture, we are making a quantum jump of critical importance. This is done deliberately, for I feel more comfortable on cloud one than on cloud seven. And I will even give our question a reverse spin by asking: What is it to be in another culture?

To be in another culture is not only to be where the average family income is 20% lower than in your own country and the average yearly rainfall 20% higher. It is not only to be where there are beautiful cathedrals and museums and a telephone system that hardly seems to work. It is not only to be where women do not vote and where men sometimes wear skirts. To be in another culture is, for the monolingual, to be where no one understands what you say, where your money won't buy anything, where people eat things you never heard of, where your companions are either too distant or too close, where there is excitement over what you would think trivial and where what you would find dramatic or tragic is merely commonplace, where those about you are living their inner lives on a wavelength that your mind simply can't pick up.

The word culture has long meant, and still means, what the farmer, the gardener, the bacteriologist mean, that is, the care and nurture of living things, whether plants or animals or microorganisms. It may also mean personal improvement and refinement by education and training. This meaning of culture is likewise of long standing, going back to the sixteenth century. Sometimes, with the humanists, we use the word to mean the general betterment of mind, tastes, and manners, the condition of being thus trained and refined--a concept that Mathew Arnold summed up in his oft-cited statement of a century ago:

"The acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world...the study and pursuit of perfection." Or we may intend, with the scientists, a very different meaning of the word, also offered just a century ago by E.B. Tyler who write: "Culture is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, law, morals, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society."

Or again we sometimes mean something still different from all these definitions. We mean what Ruth of the Old Testament meant in her reply to her mother-in-law Naomi who had directed her to return to her people, the Moabites, after the death of her husband. Ruth said:"Entreat me not to leave thee, or to return from following after thee. But whither thou goest I will go, and where thou lodgest I will lodge. Thy people shall be my people and thy god my god. Where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried." If you find something intensely personal in these words of the young widow, Ruth, that is precisely the point I wish to make. Of all the aspects of culture, this is the one that has the strongest appeal to the teacher of a second language. For there is something intensely personal about asking a learner to put aside his mother tongue for a time, to make it inactive, and to carry on the processes of thought in a new language. There can hardly be a more effective way of bringing the foreign culture into our classrooms.

If the scientist's concept of culture has tended to be too inclusive, too mechanistic, too devoid of judgement and preference, the humanist's concept, stressing as it does art and perfection, has tended to be too exclusive and to crowd out whole areas of human thought and action that merit our attention in language study. Let's face it. Fine art is not for everyone all the time. Indeed, it is not for many people any of the time. But each day each one of us must eat, must sleep. We must live and we must relate to those around us. It is this minute-by-minute, hour-by-hour, day-by-day contact between the self and the surrounding world that is the locus of what interests us most immediately in culture. It is the cumulative result of what happens here that makes us what we are, that develops our personality, that gives us the value system we live by. Just as our inner lives are rooted in our language, so is our language rooted in our culture. Really to know another person, another group of people, another nation, is to know not only how their linguistic system works, or even to have a technical command of that system. It is also, and much more, to know the dimensions of meaning that give color and texture, effectiveness, strength, and beauty to the language they use. Clearly culture implies language, but it also implies something more. We shall need to be aware of this as we pursue our analysis and presentation.

I have referred to five different meanings of culture, and I will now identify each of them with a brief distinguishing label; then, for greater convenience, do as the dictionaries do, assign a number to each of these different definitions. We may refer to the first meaning as biological growth. Culture with meaning number two we may call personal refinement. Culture_3, artistic endeavors and achievements. Culture_4, patterns for living. And culture_5, the totality of societal existence. It is the last three meanings that will occupy our attention principally in language courses. It is culture_4 that offers possibilities for exploitation in every language class, beginning even the very first day.

Having given this matter a good deal of thought, I have tried to define culture_4, patterns for living, in succinct terms. For what it is worth, here is my definition:

> Culture_4 refers to the individual's role in the unending kaleidoscope of life situations of every kind and the rules and models for attitude and conduct in them. By reference to these models, every human being,

> from infancy onward, justifies the world to himself as best he can, associates with those around him, and relates to the social order to which he is attached.

Notice that in this concept we have socially-approved models and rules to go by and unpredictable free-wheeling individuals who try to measure up to them.

The name we customarily give to what the social order expects of the individual is 'pattern'. We also need a name for the individual's more or less acceptable reply to this expectation. For this I have proposed the noun 'cónform'. We are constantly under pressure to make the cónform of our thought and behavior coincide with the model or rule of the pattern. Often--in fact, usually--we do so, but not always. In some instances the individual has unrestricted choice, free of sanction--for example, when we decide whether or not we wish to put cream in our coffee. At the other extreme, each of us still has a choice, as in deciding whether or not to stand when the Star Spangled Banner is being played, or whether or not to pay our taxes when they are due. But though we still have our choice, failure to make pattern and cónform agree is likely to be very costly.

Let me cite you the example of a young man named Meursault, the principal character in the short novel *L'Étranger* by Albert Camus. Upon the death of his mother, Meursault prefers not to have a final look at her before her coffin is closed. He smokes a cigarette and drinks coffee during the all-night vigil beside her body. He sheds no tears then nor at her grave when she is buried. The very next day he goes swimming with a former girl friend and takes her to the movies--to a comedy by Fernandel, of all things. And so on, through many another mismatch of pattern and cónform. Now, as the author of *L'Étranger* himself stated it: "In our society, any man who does not weep at his mother's funeral runs the risk of being condemned to death." It was Meursault's repeated failure to bring the cónform of his personal behavior into agreement with the pattern expected by those around him that led to his being sentenced to the guillotine.

In this emphasis upon the personal aspect of culture there is no intent to brush aside its other connotations, far from it. We should follow them where they may lead. In the pursuit of meaning, it is often just as important to be clear about what words do not stand for as about what they do stand for. In all its meanings, culture attached not only to life, either past or present, but in one way or another to human life, in itself and in its effect upon its surroundings. We speak about the culture of the Plains Indians, about culture in large cities, about culture on farms and in gardens, about the culture of pearls. But note that in all of these, human beings are directly involved. We do not speak of the culture of the winds or tides or stars. The climate and the nature of the soil, the shoreline of lakes and oceans, mountains and rivers, deposits of oil and coal and minerals under the earth-all these are things not meant by culture. Their effect upon culture may be very great, even overwhelming, but we must always distinguish sharply between the environment in which man finds himself and his interaction with that environment. There is nothing cultural about temperature or rainfall, about mountain ranges and natural resources in themselves. They would be what they are regardless of the presence of man.

Once we begin to see culture in these discriminating terms, we begin to find it everywhere. There is culture not only in the design of a building and in a national election. There is also culture in the shape of a doorway, in a stamp or a coin, in the writing of numbers, in place names, in friendly greetings, in the taste of a sauce, in the timbre of a voice, in the lilt of a song. Culture can be majestic and it can be mundane, it can be trivial and it can be tragic.

Culture, then, as we language teachers view it, is both linguistic and non-linguistic, it is both casual and dramatic, it is both personal and--

permit me the term--tribal, it is both fine art and common practice, it is both noble and down to earth. It is our privilege to make these matters clear to our students as they learn about another culture, one desired result being that they will eventually become aware that they live in a culture, too.

It would be very regrettable if this interpretation of the word culture were taken as merely trivial, on the one hand, and, on the other, as exclusive of both the esthetic and artistic side of man and of the grander lines of human thought and action that are discernible only when man is viewed in a total perspective. But criticisms such as these are far more likely to come from the related fields of literature and psychology than from language teachers themselves. The latter well know how minimal, how intinate, how undramatic, how modest the earliest steps must be in order to be able to make those giant strides that may come later. To put it another way, we would begin our conquest of music not with an attack upon a four-voice fugue but with finger exercises and two-part inventions.

HOW CAN WE TEACH CULTURE?

If we agree that the analysis of culture we have been presenting is the most useful for language teachers, we must now pose the practical question: How can we teach it? In our answer we shall surely relate culture to language, yet see it as something distinct and different. If we permit ouselves to be systematic in our analysis of culture, we must insist upon being programmatic in presenting it for assimilation by the youthful learner.

In teaching our students about a given culture we will do well first to communicate to them, in their terms, some basic notions of what our understanding of culture is. We may ask them to read, and then discuss with them, The Man Without a Country by E.E. Hale, or the short story by Somerset Maugham entitled "The Pool", or even a longer work, the third section of the Bounty Trilogy by Nordhof and

Hall, entitled Pitcairn's Island. All these illustrate in a dramatic way the connotations of culture we are dicussing. And if we are to be honest with ourselves, and with our students, we must of course admit that there is an intimate dimension, a seamy side to the tapestry of life we shall present, and recognize, with them, that there is much in culture that we must treat gingerly or let alone. Religion, politics, and sex will inevitably make their presence felt, but they can hardly be treated as principal themes in teaching culture in the classroom. Even so, we shall still be left with plenty to talk about.

A duality of presentation is a recommendable procedure in all cultural matters. We need to hear from the native of the culture in question and we need also to hear from the sympathetic and well-informed non-native. A native is likely to tell us about his own culture more or less what a mother would tell us about her own daughter. This tends to be informative, interesting, and often colorful. But inevitably it is incomplete and--let's admit it--somewhat biased. We need to hear as well a neighbor's description of the young lady. Each point of view will tend to amplify and complement the other. Thus we shall end by having a far truer and more useful picture of the kind of girl Margery really is. As an example of the need for knowing culture from both without and within, let me cite a few familiar expressions. We all know how the French say "To take French leave"--"Filer á l'anglaise." Then how do the Greeks say: "That's Greek to me?" What is Chinese for "A chinese puzzle?" How do the Italians speak of a "Fine Italian hand?" And what is Dutch for "Going Dutch?"

There is a further duality of analysis and presentation with regard to culture$_4$, that is, what is easy to see and what is hard to see, what is so obvious that he who runs may read and what is so tenuous and subtle that it passes, for the most part, quite unnoticed. An example of the first, in our culture, would be the academy awards of moviedom; an example of the second would be the normal distance from nose to nose in a friendly conversation. Both these examples bear a high charge of culture. Various sets of terms have been proposed to aid in distinguishing these two areas. Overt and covert have been used, formal and deep, manifest and hidden. Whatever name we employ, the essential difference should be emphasized. In formal or manifest culture, the individual is named and made much of, often wearing special dress, being given a present, receiving a written or token recognition of success achieved or distinction won. Such events are birthdays, weddings, commencement exercises, and Nobel prizes. Deep or hidden culture is that slow, persistent, almost imperceptible process whereby we learn how to be honest, how to speak intimately with our peers, how to dress and gesture as others do, how to think as they do, how to believe and prefer and admire and disdain and laugh and worship as they do. These are not things that the individual would dream up by himself. They are the result of his having lived at close quarters in the early part of his life with others who thought and believed and acted that way.

A culture may be observed as it is in all its various manifestations at a given time. We may take a cross-section of the total community life as of today or some selected date and consider all its members, all their actions, all their beliefs and thoughts and wishes, both from the point of view of the individual and of the totality. This is both interesting and useful and is likely to be full of surprises. It will surely give us a complete picture of what life at any given moment is like or was like. But many of the things we observe--take hats, for example, or the right to vote--will not be new as of the time of observation. They will have a more or less lengthy history and have played a traditional role, subject to changes and modifications, in the total cultural picture. If then, instead of considering the cross-section, we look backward in the historical perspective and trace the various manifestations we observe to their origin, noting their continuing development and change, we have still another aspect of culture, one that is also indispensable for a full understanding of community life.

It will help our students greatly if we ourselves are consistently clear about the difference, already referred to, between culture and non-culture. If we were to open our eyes suddenly and discover that we were standing on an island in the middle of an isolated lake, say, in northern Maine, it is likely that we should perceive nothing cultural at all, except ourselves and whatever means was used to get us there. The stones and trees and animals, the water and the sky, the clouds and the sunshine, could not in any sense be called cultural. Again, if we were to open our eyes and find ourselves standing in the midst of a large city, we would be surrounded by things cultural on every side: the buildings, the streets, the people, the traffic signs, the noises, the odors, the easy access to many objects of desire--and the threat of death if we do not conform to complicated rules for moving about. The shape of a maple leaf, the song of a bluebird, the fragrance of a linden tree, an eclipse of the sun are all examples of non-culture. They would be exactly what they are whether there were any men to perceive and enjoy them or not. As we know, such matters are sometimes interwoven with cultural patterns until they become of extreme importance in human affairs (we may recall the designing of the new Canadian flag), but in the study of culture a distinction must always be made between things in themselves and their effect upon man or man's effect upon them.

A consideration first of the individual and then of the group will give another pair of complementary aspects of culture. We may study group activities intensively and for a long time without even discovering certain matters that are of key importance in a culture. By the same token, we may study individuals carefully and at length and still get no inkling of other patterns that can be observed only when people are reacting in a group. No amount of observation of personal behavior would give any hint of the goings-on at a national political convention in the United States. Nor would any amount of observation of group behavior reveal the essence of a mother's tenderness desplayed when she is alone with her infant child. Life is lived both individually and in groups, and the full story of the culture is not known until both the individual and group aspects have been reviewed and related to each other.

Perhaps the most important pair of aspects is the appearance that a culture has for the artist--the man of letters, the musician, the sculptor, the choreographer, on the one hand, and, on the other, for the scientist, in our case the cultural anthropologist. It will require no review of the philosophy of humanism or the philosophy of science to remind us that these two aspects will have very different emphases. The kind of report that will be given by a Dickens or a Proust will differ greatly from the kind of report given by a Margaret Mead or even an Elizabeth Thomas, in spite of the fact that all will have been working from careful observation of the community life they are describing. The scientist will have been concerned about a factual, complete, and accurate recital of what he has observed with nothing added and nothing left out, both in the grand lines and the minute details of thought and action. The creative artist, whether poet or painter, song writer or novelist, though working from no less authentic models, will have permitted himself to accept and reject, to embellish and caricature, to make composites taken partly from one thing, partly from another, and partly from nothing at all. Instead of trying to curb the subjective and emotional element in his report, he will have allowed his imagination free rein and have permitted his creative urge to present that which he has seen and experienced in what may often be both different from and more than the simple truth, though based unquestionably upon it, because he wishes to entertain, to impress, and to persuade. The results of these two kinds of efforts are equally valuable, for each presents the truth as he believes it should be presented, though each arrives at his final production in a very different way.

Both humanists and scientists have a heavy stake in the word culture, and it is no surprise to find that their different value systems are thrown into sharp contrast when we compare these two disparate areas of meaning for which the same word must be used. Language teachers are now becoming aware that theirs is a mid-position between humanism and science. Instruction in culture that takes place in a language classroom is therefore likely to be oriented toward both the "best" and the "all", with full awareness of the differences that the two concepts imply.

For the language teacher, culture is far more than history or geography or art or sociology. To teach culture as we would teach it, it is not enough to draw a map, it is not enough merely to recite the events of the past, it is not enough to describe the legal system or the educational system or to tabulate vital statistics. It is not enough even to read a novel or a poem or to visit a museum or attend a concert or a play. All these are vitally important, but if we stop there we are a long, long way from our goal. What is the impact of all this upon the persons whose culture we are studying? How do they react to these things and to each other? Culture is imprinted line by line and page by page upon the thoughts and deeds of those who are a part of it, and it is these lines and pages we must read and interpret if we are to understand.

As we teach our student about a foreign culture, it is our intent that he will become better acquainted with the culture in which he himself has grown up. We shall have to be both patient and discreet about this. But in the familiar metaphor, the time comes when the window opening up upon another culture becomes a mirror in which we can better see ourselves. I referred a little while ago to the determination of Ruth to forsake her own culture and adopt that of her mother-in-law. I hardly need say that this is not our aim in language classes. Our purpose is not to convert but to demonstrate and inform, to instill sympathetic understanding, to teach our students what life's problems and rewards would be like if they were members of the target culture. Our purpose is to develop in our students an insight and an awareness concerning another culture. At the same time, it is our hope that they, as their studies progress, will become more firmly attached to their own. To be culturally uprooted is a very serious matter and unless one is transplanted and grows fresh roots in the new culture (one thinks of Henry James or T.S. Eliot) the result can be tragic indeed.

We can often teach culture without there being any awareness of it. For there is--or can be--culture in the way we give directives, the way we correct and encourage, the manner in which we admonish and praise, the by-the-way expressions and gestures we use as we react to the ongoing events of a classroom. Where will we find the time to teach culture, you ask? Well, we are going to be master of ceremonies in our own classrooms. Why not do this in ways that are culturally authentic? We are going to be calling our students something, and they are going to be calling us something. Why would not these terms of address be authentic to the foreign culture? Students are going to be saying things aloud, why not insist that the sounds and intonations be culturally valid? We are going to be asking questions. Why not ask some that bring out cultural details? Our students are going to be writing dictations. Why not choose passages that throw into relief some facts or reactions that are culturally significant? They are going to be writing sentences and paragraphs and compositions. Why not, in some of this work, emphasize what is culturally important? And above all, both we and our students are going to be talking. Why not talk, at least most of the time, in the language of the culture we are presenting? From the point of view of culture, we ought to make quite an issue of staying with either one language or the other. This is not an argument for the direct method, which is something else again. But it is a strong plea for putting our students, as often as we reasonably can, in a situation that is culturally authentic simply because while they are in it their own language won't work.

HOW CAN WE MEASURE WHAT WE HAVE TAUGHT?

Measurement relates more directly to learning than to teaching. We have to remember that sometimes we teach, quite vehemently, to the tune of very little learning or none at all. On the other hand, sometimes, in spite of the quality (or lack of it) in our teaching, our students appear to learn anyway. But there is undeniably a basic relationship between teaching and learning, and one reason why we have not yet been very successful in testing for culture is that up to now we have quite simply not taught it very well. But as the nature and orientation of our teaching improve, we may be confident that our testing will do likewise.

Any serious discussion of measurement properly begins with test specifications and item types. A good test program should be related one to one with the curriculum and be planned along with it. Just as thought is now being given to the curriculum role of culture through at least four levels, the same should be done for the testing of culture. This is a large order, and is far more than we can attempt in our present discussion. But we may at least consider some basic principles and suggest a few kinds of questions or item types that may be used in measuring progress in the study of culture.

If learning has taken place, there is growth and change, something has been added, something is in a higher state of integration than it was before. Relationships that were hidden are now perceived, intellectual light has penetrated farther and to new depths, judgments have been revised, and attitudes have been modified or reversed. In measuring for culture we are no longer measuring for competence in a skill. We are measuring now for factual information, of course, but also for awareness, for insight, for sensitivity, for interpretation, for attitude. We are measuring matters both linguistic and non-linguistic. Do our students know the appropriate thing to say or to do in order to be rightly understood and not to offend? Can they recognize in what they read, in what they hear, in what they see, that which is culturally meaningful to those about whom they are learning? In measurement for language we are concerned about the tense and form of the verb, about the position and agreement of the adjective, the choice of word, the aptness of the idiom, the merit of the sentence. In measurement of culture we are concerned with the choice of a rejoinder, the meaning of a gesture, the importance of a holiday, the popularity of a pastime, the attitude toward women, the welcome accorded a stranger, and expressions of personal dignity.

Since we are testing in a new area, a new set of basic principles should be drawn up, quite distinct from those we have adhered to in language testing. This can hardly be done by any one person, but I would like to enumerate a few points that ought not to be overlooked. Here is a list of suggestions:

1. Make appropriate use of two languages, both the learner's mother tongue and the target language.
2. Keep in mind the distinctive character of the four levels (or six levels) and what can be learned in each one.
3. Keep in mind the concepts of $culture_3$, $culture_4$, and $culture_5$ as we have just described them and test for each one at a suitable time and in a suitable way.
4. Remember that we are measuring for fact, for interpretation, and for attitude, and devise questions for all three.
5. Do not let language difficulties negate the effective measurement of cultural insight.
6. Invite equal collaboration of both school and college teachers in the construction of tests.
7. Involve both native and non-native speakers, equally, in the making of tests.

As for item types, a few suggestions can be offered here also, although they are tentative, unproven, and imcomplete. Here are three proposed types of items:

1. A pragmatic rejoinder item. This involves a choice of answers that are all fully right syntactically, fully right semantically, but may or may not be acceptable in a given situation.
   Instructions: Choose the most appropriate rejoinder.
   Example: As you go into a friend's house to spend the evening your host says to you: May I take your coat? Rejoinders:
   Any time; No thank you; If you like; May I take yours?
2. A footnote item. Two possible uses are suggested. In one, the student reads a page of text in which he is asked to identify 8 or 10 words or expressions that are in need not of grammatical or vocabulary explanation but of cultural comment. Such a test could be made much harder, but equally justifiable, by selecting certain words or expressions in advance and asking the student to supply the footnote.
3. A profile test. The word is intended as it was developed by the New Yorker magazine and is now widely used in the press. In form it is quite different from the usual biographical or descriptive sketch. In our test a profile may describe a holiday, a ceremony, a happening, or an important personality. From a list of names the student selects the person or event being described. This too can be made harder by giving the student a subject and asking him to write the profile--something he must of course be trained to do. This could be a very useful technique in the teaching of writing.

You will note that in these items we are making use of the time-honored "recognition" and "recall".

At this point you may well wonder why, in talking about culture, I have made no mention of historical monuments and famous sights, theatres and concerts, books, statues, and paintings; no mention of the great systems that any society has, of education, law, finances, transportation, politics, religion; no mention of wars and great events in the national history; no mention of the ethos of a country, its composite character and its unique view of the world. This is not because I find these matters unimportant. They are all exceedingly important. It is rather because subjects of this kind are quite well treated already, and the presentation of them is sure to improve. On the other hand, the "pattern of living" area of culture has been little exploited because it has been little understood. I hope I have shown that for the language teacher this is the area of greatest immediate appeal. Susanne Langer has said: "Most new discoveries are suddenly-seen things that were always there." May I add that I believe we should not be too ready, in the study of culture, to denigrate the commonplace. After all, that is where we all spend a good deal of our time.

FOLLOWING THE LANGUAGE LEARNER FROM SCHOOL TO COLLEGE*

Nelson Brooks
Yale University

The other day I was listening to a cynic who said: "Schools are places where the only serious effort made is aimed at getting the student into college--and never mind how well he does when he gets there. Teachers in schools keep good discipline but they are not very competent in languages. Students are put into language classes by guidance counsellors who don't know what else to do with them and they are put out of language classes by teachers who do not welcome those who can't learn their way. The schools send to colleges two kinds of students: those who can understand and speak but who can't read or write, and those who can read and write but can't understand or speak. Neither kind knows any grammar at all. Colleges, in contrast, are places where absolutely nothing is known about the schools, where teaching is relatively unimportant and is therefore inept, where faculty members know everything about their subject except how to teach it, where language skills are merely taken for granted, where culture is equivalent to the life of the spirit, and where literature is all."

After thinking this over for a while, I began to wonder if there might be in what this cynic said something worth discussing with teachers in the Northwest. Then I suddenly realized that I had been listening to an East Coast cynic. I had no reason at all to think that such views would be entertained in this area. It is therefore quite a different text that I shall read to you. Even so, I am not sure how well it will apply here. I am only a Connecticut Yankee a long way from home, and I ask your indulgence.

---

*A talk given at a meeting of the A A T F, Pacific Northwest Conference, Carroll College, Helena, Montana, April 20, 1968.

Teachers of foreign languages in schools and in colleges need to explore ways in which a better relationship may be set up between these two areas of instruction. A start may be made by listing some of the characteristics that each area possesses.

A few familiar terms will remind us of what life is like at the secondary school level. Teachers in schools live in a world that is what it is because of I Q's, college entrance examinations, lesson plans, and band practice; attendance records, principals, guidance counselling, and lunch hours; PTA's, Boards of Education, report cards, and discipline; the Red Cross, home rooms, tenure, and school spirit.

The college teacher lives in a world of seminars, warning grades, professional journals, and bibliography; section meetings, publication, advanced degrees, and orals; professorships, research, dean's lists, and faculty meetings; lecture notes, departmental majors, bluebooks, and dissertations.

To point up the contrast in another way, language programs as they are carried out in schools tend to show a pattern of collaboration and team work that is quite different from the spirit of individualism that animates the members of a college faculty. This is not surprising, for after all, scholarly work in our field is almost entirely indinidual work. Ph. D. degrees are seldom given to a team, such as Fraser and Squair. They are given, rather, to the individual for demonstrating how competent, imaginative, and resourceful he is when working on his own.

For the most part, the teacher in the secondary school concentrates upon developing the intellect, the character, and the personality of the students in his classes, and upon preparing them for college and for life in the adult world. Such a teacher has his own professional growth and development to think of also, but I believe it is fair to say that the major effort he puts forth is focussed, directly or indirectly, upon learning and the learner.

For the college teacher, things fall into a different pattern. He is concerned not only about the students in his classes, he is under obligation to be constantly active in the world of scholarship in order to maintain his position and improve it. He must seek a doctor's degree and he must publish both articles and books in his chosen field. However enthusiastic and successful a college instructor may be with regard to classroom teaching, he soon discovers that this is but a part of what he will receive credit for professionally, and that there are other and quite different activities he must engage in if he is to prosper in his career.

To consider the learner for a moment, what varieties of experience are there for him as he sits through the long sequence of classroom hours, first in school and then in college? In answer, we may review what the student's activities are as he begins his course and continues with it. There seems to be a consensus now that the successive stages of instruction through which the learner goes can be marked off into three distinct phases, each containing two levels (a level being approximately the work of a single year in the senior high school, the college.) At the end of the first phase we may say that the learner has completed a basic course. The second phase, levels three and four, bring him to a recognized degree of language competence. The third phase, levels five and six, should provide him with a measurable degree of competence, even though only introductory, in literary studies. Naturally, the character of the work he does will vary greatly from one phase to the next.

In the basic course he will be mainly occupied in gaining competence in the four language skills and control over the structure of the language, especially in its spoken form, using the minimum vocabulary necessary for these objectives. The emphasis changes sharply, however, in phase two. Without any less concern for the skills and for structure, he must now apply himself to the acquisition of vocabulary and idiom, and have an extended experience in reading, accompanied by the best possible training in writing. He may then go on to phase three, engaging in work that keeps alive all his control of language, but that now finds time for an extended experience in cultural and literary studies.

A very desirable plan would be for as many students as possible to complete phase two, the "language requirement", at the time they complete the twelfth grade. Colleges are both willing and well prepared to accept the learner at this point, and to provide for him an agreeable and profitable continuation in what we have referred to as levels five and six. What college faculties want to so, seemingly, to the last man (or woman) is to teach literature. But they can teach it only to those students who have gained the necessary command of all the language skills and who know what reading and writing mean in terms of literary study.

Now the fact is that for a large number of students this desirable scheme does not fall neatly ino place. Many of them come to college with only a basic course to their credit, and even then many are lacking in one or more of the basic skills. Or they come woth a reasonably good basic course but without the knowledge of vocabulary and the extensive reading experience that would bring them to the point of a recognized language competence.

Confusing and frustrating is the predicament of the college instructor who faces a class of, say, twenty students each of whom has had a different pattern of preparation for the language requirement. The training in teaching which the instructor has had (if indeed he has had any) has usually not prepared him for this dismaying prospect. As a result, many a time, not because he wishes to but because he does not know what else to do, he talks to the class in English, he asks the students to translate, and he does his best to teach them a little grammar--which they never know in the way he does. Whether or not this is what the students wish to do, or whether any of them can do far more than this, is lost in the dissolving fact that this is the one program all can engage in.

It is legitimate to ask why all twenty of these students have been admitted to Course 101, and yet have had such a widely different preparation. One thing is crystal clear: it is not the fault of the students. We may put the blame on the placement examination, on the entrance examination, on the materials the student has been studying from, on the teachers under whose direction he has worked, on administration and guidance and curriculum planning for not architecting the right course of study, on the parents for insisting that the students take this and not take that--but we should not blame the student himself. Is it his fault if Student A, who has already read several novels and plays and can translate passages from them reasonably well, but who cannot understand a single word that is spoken to him in the foreign language, finds himself sitting beside Student B, who chats quite glibly in French but who has not, so far, read a single page of what micht be called a literary text and who cannot write a respectable paragraph in the foreign language about anything?

The instructor whose dilemma we are describing operates at one of the most critical points in the sequence of our language programs. It would appear to be a professional responsibility of the first order to diminish this diversity of preparation and, at the same time, to aid the instructor in dealing with the degree of diversity that cannot be eliminated altogether.

To confront the second part of this obligation first, we may as well state a few blunt facts. The competence and good will of the instructor are never in question. But his experience as a teacher tends to be brief, his preparation for teaching even briefer, and the supervision of his work practically nil, not to mention the fact that his interest in his work as a teacher is often diminished or interfered with by his other professional interests, for reasons we have mentioned. He succeeds well with well-prepared students. It is with those whose preparation is inadequate or uneven that he falters, for they are in need of that which he is least well prepared to teach. It is not too much to say that colleges have a most serious obligation to provide such an instructor with the training and supervision necessary to help these students with their difficulties. Happily, this obligation is slowly being realized. Within very recent years, courses and programs to this effect have been initiated on many campuses, providing for those who give instruction of this kind the support and direction they need.

To confront the first phase of this problem--that is, why the preparation in the schools has been so varied--is a different matter, but this too is a professional responsibility, having an importance and an urgency quite as great as any that falls upon the colleges. The lack of a reasonable degree of sameness in the students' experience at the school level can no longer be laid to the lack of appropriate recommendations or of appropriate materials or of appropriate tests. Thanks to the professional leadership that has been provided by the Modern Language Association ever since 1952 and thanks to the funds that have been forthcoming from the federal government since 1958, through the NDEA, it is now quite clear what secondary school courses should accomplish, how they can be made to do so, and, as well, how we can measure to find out whether they have or not.

There would seem to remain two crucial questions: Can the teacher teach in the desired way? and: Is he willing to do so? A sustained and quite successful effort is being made to aid the teacher in the matter of language competence and teaching techniques, again with the aid of federal funds, in the Institute Programs with which we are all well acquainted. There is every hope that these will continue in quality, in variety, and in effectiveness. This leaves us with the final and delicate question concerning the teacher's willingness to teach in the recommended way. It is well known that a pattern of polarity is to be observed in the overall picture of what is happening in language classes in our schools and colleges. The polarity becomes distinct as we note what occurs in classrooms with regard to five sensitive points:

the use of English, the role of translation, the explanation of grammar, the use of printed texts, and the use of quizzes and tests. According to data gathered by the Educational Testing Service, there is a clustering of institutions that follow what we may call the traditional approach at one point and those that follow the audiolingual approach at another. For the moment, we need not attempt to evaluate either of these, but we are bound to recognize that the opposition exists, and that it has much to do with the variation in preparation which our college instructor faces in September in his division of Course 101.

If we are to integrate the two worlds of school and college language instruction, we can hardly hope to succeed without arranging for an extensive exchange of information about each one, to be provided for and assimilated by the other. Likewise, an exchange of information is necessary between those who teach traditionally and those who teach language as communication. But there is a difference here that I must beg leave to point out. We all know what the traditional approach is, both those who teach in this way and those who do not. The reverse, however, is not true. What is meant by the audiolingual approach, what goes on in a so-called audiolingual classroom, is often not known by those who teach traditionally, for the reason that they have not been in such classes long enough or often enough to be fully informed. Clearly, if we are to inaugurate a new phase of exchange of information, this is a proper place to begin.

Having identified a number of problems and critical issues, we may go on to suggest some ways in which they may be confronted. As is often the case, it is less a matter of creating new positions, new functions, new organizations, and more a matter of recognizing areas where a potential for improvement already exists, providing ways and means of setting up lines of communication between them, and preparing the plans, the messages, and the findings that can flow back and forth.

On every undergraduate faculty there will be found one person who is responsible for the content and the direction of the various language courses that are offered. This person may be the chairman of the department himself or it may be someone else who is designated to supervise this work. In any event, this person is very conversant with the nature of the different courses and with the preparation that is expected of students who are placed in them and with the quality of the results eventually obtained. Such a person is naturally much interested in the competence that students bring from the schools, for this is germane to his problem of assigning students to the level where that can work to best advantage and to the problem of adjusting course content to student preparation. He is no less concerned about the requirements of courses that are to follow.

Those who teach in schools should know that such a coordinator of undergraduate courses exists and that there is a high degree of identity between his interests and theirs. In the schools the principal, the department chairman, or the supervisor of languages has a comparable view of what is in progress at different levels on the part of different teachers and classes. Administration officers and guidance counselors, although they may not actually be teaching language courses, often watch them rather closely and are rightfully concerned about their general character and their success in preparing students for college. It would seem that lists of names, identifying the persons I have described, could be drawn up and kept current. Thus, either school or college could know to whom a request for information could be addressed what the occasion arises.

In addition to individuals, there are A A T organizations that could well cooperate in attacking pedagogical problems even more actively than they have up to now. As a means whereby professional consideration can be given to such matters by teachers in both schools and colleges working together, I would suggest a wider use of the so-called "working committee" plan, which has been very successfully used in regional conferences since 1952. Most of the national organizations of language teachers hold regularly scheduled meetings once or twice a year. The working committee plan could well be taken as a model or guide for setting up a design whereby specific problems can be identified, persons enlisted to work on them and reports and recommendations prepared for discussion at regular meetings of the larger groups. Such a scheme calls for no little initiative, organization, and extra work. But happily, in our profession today there are great potentials for these available everywhere, at both school and college levels. The schools have amply demonstrated this in the thousands of participants that have attended NDEA Institutes since 1959. The colleges have demonstrated it also, especially in the corps of past and present Directors of these language Institutes and in the members of college faculties who have staffed these programs. It goes without saying that we shall not have complete professional agreement on all the matters we discuss, but it is beneath our professional self-respect not to be informed about the nature of these problems and the substance of our colleagues' opinions and recommendations concerning them.

As we look ahead to what the subjects of some of these working committees assignments might be, aiming toward better communication, cooperation, and collaboration between our two worlds, we may list a number of topics and themes that merit sustained attention. One of the first that comes to mind is visits. No single activity could contribute more toward what we are aiming at than a well-devised and duly executed program of visits to language classes, on the part of college teachers to schools, and of school teachers to colleges, and, as well, a more active program of visits at one's own level. Visits are time-consuming; they require a certain amount of planning, protocol and polite insistence. But it is amazing how quickly and how radically opinions firmly held can be altered as a result of direct observation of what happens in a classroom. The degree of enlightenment and of encouragement that can come from visits is phenomenal, and they are well worth what they cost. There is, in the Modern Language Journal for November, 1966, an extremely valuable report by Joseph Vocolo and Douglas Sheppard entitled: "High School--College Intervisitation" telling the story of such a project as it was carried out in Buffalo, New York, in tha fall of 1965.

Another vital topic is the teaching of writing. We who teach foreign languages should not feel too frustrated if we are forced to admit that we really don't do this very well. Our colleagues who teach English don't do it very well either, and this is one of the liveliest issues in their revolution which is just getting under way. There is a book on this subject that can be most valuable to us, as it is to them, in improving results in this direction. The title of this book is How the French Boy Learns to Write, and it was written in 1915 by Rollo W. Brown. Long out of print, it has recently been re-issued by the National Council of Teachers of English. (It is available through the M. L. A.) Everyone who is concerned with teaching students to write in a foreign language should make an intensive study of this book. We may be confident that reports on it and discussions of its many suggestions would greatly benefit language teachers at all levels. I cannot refrain from saying, in passing, that we are likely to find two paths to good writing that are so far relatively unexplored. One is the importance of the sentence exercise in composition before putting pen to paper.

Another important matter is maturity and course content. Many of those who teach in the schools now take their students through a course thatnot only puts them in very good command of language skills but also provides them with a close acquaintance with a number of literary texts. What guidelines can be suggested for carrying out this more advanced part of the work? To put it another way, what is to be the twelfth grader's experience with a literary text in the foreign language? The answer will be related not only to his command of the skills and of vocabulary but as well to two other major matters. One of these will be the kind of experience he is currently having in his course in senior English. The other will be the degree of intellectual maturity we can expect him to have. Again, we can foresee the valuable reports, comments, and suggestions that could result from serious school-college committee thinking on this arresting subject. Related to this, to be sure, is the Advanced Placement Program. This merits much discussion, too. But for the moment we are thinking only of what we may call our regular course for seniors in levels five and six. In the Reports of the Northeast Conference for 1967 there is a piece entitled: "The Times and Places for Literature" that could serve as an excellent starting point for a study of this kind.

This is but a brief list that any language teacher could augment with equally significant tipics upon which our professional attention could be focused in such joint efforts. We may conclude by affirming once more that the potential for better coordination between schools and colleges in foreign language instruction is clearly in evidence everywhere. Our need is to channel our interests and activities in such a way as to make them fully complementary and mutually effective.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION AND GEORGIA*

by

NELSON BROOKS

YALE UNIVERSITY

The title of my talk is "Foreign Language Instruction and Georgia". It is divided into two parts, the first called "Rainbows" and the second "Questions". By rainbow I mean a spectrum, a form in which we can often present a number of things that are related to each other but in which we wish to see differences together with sequential arrangement. The colors of the rainbow provide a good model for this kind of presentation.

The first I have called the Curriculum Spectrum. The first sector is FLES, the second Junior High School, the next Senior High School, then College, then Graduate School, and finally Continuing Education. A curriculum, as we know, is really a race course. Our student must enter this race in one of these sectors and continue through the next and the next until the course is finished or he gives up. Several things are at once apparent when we look at this spectrum. For one thing, when we speak of methods or materials we need to indicate of which sector we are speaking, how long the students we refer to have been in the race, and how the methods or materials relate to those used in the preceding or the following sector. Also, FLES appears, in this arrangement, as the beginning of a serious course of study and its relationship to what follows is at once visible. The model also shows us that we, as individual teachers, are likely to remain in a given sector, while the student must move through one after the other, and the work we ask him to do should always reflect awareness of an overall plan.

---

* A talk given at Macon, Georgia, October 18, 1969, to the Classical and Modern Foreign Language Association of Georgia.

The second spectrum is called Linguistic. It has five sectors, as follows: syntactics, semantics, pragmatics, culture, and literature. Syntactics refers to what we generally just call grammar, in its broadest sense; the grammar of sounds, of forms, and of sentence patterns--the study of the signs of language as they relate to each other. In the second sector, semantics, we study the ways in which the changing forms of syntactics are able to carry meaning. A dictionary is to semantics as a grammar is to syntactics. In the third sector, pragmatics, we study language in use which means we must have in mind not only the facts of grammar and vocabulary but also something about the person who is using language to express his thought. Here the individual enters the language picture and we have to take him into account as well as the system of language. The fourth sector we have named culture, remembering that there are both verbal and non-verbal areas in culture. Here we can dwell upon the significance of language in the life of the individual and in the social order to which he belongs. In the fifth sector, literature, language is raised to the level of fine art, with all the uses and refinements and esthetic experiences that are implied. Presenting these matters in the form of a spectrum reminds us of their interrelationship and of the function of language as the working material of the literary artist.

The third spectrum we call the psychological or 'Vygotsky' spectrum. It is the result of a careful study of the final chapter of Lev Vygotsky's book Thought and Language and the application of his many suggestions to our work in language instruction. This spectrum is a broader one, with nine different sectors. They are: consciousness, thought, thought in words, inner speech; then spoken monologue, spoken dialogue, talk in general, writing in general, and language in the form of literature. When we practice language we move about with great rapidity from one of these sectors to another. If this model helps us understand what we go through as we make use of our mother tongue, it also illustrates the task of the language teacher who must provide for his students an experience in a second language that replicates, as far as possible, the experience of one's first language. We see at once that true bilingualism involves a doubling of the spectrum, and this shows how ambitious we are in the language programs in which we are now engaged.

There is still another spectrum we can call the culture spectrum, this time a more familiar one. It has five sectors, biological growth, personal refinement, artistic activity, patterns for living, and a total way of life. An important assignment for us at the present time is to see to what extent we can make these cultural matters a vital part of language instruction at all levels. This is probably best done by beginning with the fourth sector and we may pause briefly to see what lies within this culture sector. We may say that there are to be found in it the constants of the human predicament. These may be identified as follows: the ego-self, the family, the conscience, the household, health, adjustment to environment, emotional attachments, education, individual and group relations, and belief and value. For the moment we are only passing these matters in quick review, but upon closer inspection we would soon see the potential here for a direct impact upon our language programs from the very beginning.

A fifth spectrum is called 'Master Plan' and this refers not only to Georgia but to every other state. The Master Plan as we think of it now is divided into nine sectors and we can do no more at the moment than to recite quickly the titles of each of these sectors. They are: Concepts, Structures, People, Materials, Institutions, Professional Organizations, Research, Control, and Support and Implementation. A full elaboration of this schematic plan would provide a place for each of the elements, personal, material, and other, that go to make up the total fabric of language instruction in formal education as we practice it today. One very significant value of such a plan would be that each individual teacher could see where he fits in to a grand scheme of educational effort.

These then are our five rainbows: curriculum, linguistic, psychological, cultural, and master plan. They are the tools of thought that can help us conceive in a more comprehensive way the importance and the value of our work.

In the second part of this talk we will ask a few questions, then attempt to find answers. My first question is "What is the ideal of foreign language instruction?" A second, "Can this ideal be realized in formal schooling?" Another, "Can the ground work for ideal instruction be made in formal schooling?" And further, "Is there a different ideal for modern and for classical languages?" I believe that the ideal for FL instruction should be nothing less than bilingualism. I know quite well that this goal is very difficult of attainment. But this is hardly an argument to present against an ideal. You will remember the advice of Robert Browning: A man's reach should exceed his grasp, or what's a heaven for? Our ideal needs definition, and I would define bilingualism thus: Bilingualism is the habitual use of two languages, each independent of the other, by the same individual. Now, we know that to use a language one must know what it means, and meaning takes us to culture. Therefore, really to be bilingual means to be bicultural. Though all that we are usually able to do in formal education in a foreign language may be far from true bilingualism, this is not to say that the beginnings of bilingualism cannot be established. Bilingualism is not a state one attains to suddenly, after a long period of learning. It begins the moment one starts to use two languages separately, in a way comparable to native-speaker use, and it grows steadily as knowledge of the two languages increases. It is like playing two musical instruments, which of course cannot be played at the same time. What does bilingualism mean in the study of Latin? Goals are naturally quite different in the classical languages. Language behavior, as we know, is both audiolingual, or face to face, and visual-graphic, or face to page. In a modern language, the learner works toward both audiolingual and visual-graphic control. In Latin he works toward a visual-graphic control. There are two books of special interest here because they relate to the cultural dimension of bilingualism. For those in the field of Latin I would recommend George Shipway's The Imperial Governor. For those in a contemporary language, Nordhoff and Hall's Pitcairn's Island. These are books that both teachers and students may read and discuss in the light of their valuable insights into the area of culture.

What shall we say of the present state of affairs and the future prospects in our profession? We can believe, I think, that our profession is in good estate. But the situation is dynamic, meaning that changes are imminent and we must be sure that they are of the right kind. Here are some suggestions for better control and improvement of our activities. For one thing we need to recognize that students come to our classes with a variety of goals in mind, as well as a variety of competencies in language learning. We should recognize that some will be more ambitious and some less, and provide room in our curricula for those who are willing to work but who have different intentions in mind. For example, at the secondary level we need not only courses for those who expect to continue their formal education in college but also for those who will not go beyond the secondary level.

Another question is this: In the total academic picture, where does our profession belong? The answer, I think, is clear, and needs to be clearly stated. We belong, unequivocally, to the humanities. We rely heavily on the sciences in the beginning of our work, but our task is not complete until we have taken our learners into an area that is undoubtedly humanistic. To make our position understandable both to ourselves and to others we must first define with care what we mean by the humanities. Then outline, with equal care, the honorable place that foreign language instruction holds in this sector of the academic spectrum.

To borrow a term from the younger generation, we need to make our teaching more relevant. This we can do by providing better content in our courses at all levels of learning as well as more dynamic and imaginative programs in our daily classes. One area of rich resource for bringing variety of appealing content into our courses is culture, with all the meanings we have suggested. What is the key to more relevant teaching of culture? I would say that we can find it in the word, or rather the morpheme, '-ness'. We should seek out and identify, under the rubric culture, the Frenchness of the French, the Germanness of the Germans, the Spanishness of those who speak Spanish, the Latinness of those who used to speak Latin. Pursuit along these lines will lead us to the unique quality that sets off one language community from another in terms of its patterns of living, its accomplishments, its beliefs and values, its solutions for life's standard problems.

A reasonable question that often accompanies those we have listed is this: How can I as an individual teacher improve my teaching? Here are some suggestions. The first: visit the class of a colleague who teaches your subject, and have your colleague visit you. Visits are not always easy to arrange; all sorts of administrative difficulties, schedule obstacles, and protocol matters are sure to be encountered. Nevertheless, even a few visits can be of enormous help in modifying and changing and improving our way of teaching. In addition to visits, we can exchange tapes made in our own classes, amateur recordings with all kinds of faults, yet remarkably revealing as candid shots of what we or our students are doing. They will have both strengths and weaknesses, and can be depended upon to help us improve. A third plan is a description by the teacher of a successful technique that he or she has proposed and perfected in the classroom. Such a description can be brief, and can include the following: where are the students on the curriculum spectrum, how old are they, how long have they studied the subject, what is the aim of the technique, what does the teacher do, what do the students do, what is the role of the blackboard or technical aids, what manifest learning results? All these, and of course many others, are ways of being critical of ourselves and of each other, but critical in a positive and constructive way.

Here is a short report on a briefing of college instructors at Yale University last September on the day before classes began. It may well have in it some suggestions for all of us. Professor Sammons, the Chairman of the German Department, addressed a group of beginning teachers and made these recommendations: 1) Be cheerful, 2) Stay on your feet, 3) Use the blackboard, 4) Be prepared, 5) Keep the proper pace, 6) Give fluency priority over correctness, 7) Support the text, 8) Avoid snafu in assignments.

May I bring to a close these remarks on foreign language instruction and Georgia with a reference to the statewide FLES program now in progress. As we know, the whole concept of audiolingual owes a great deal to FLES, and the current Georgia venture in television FLES is of an importance and scope and size that is truly impressive. We should view it in the light of the spectrum I spoke of at the beginning of this talk, and see it as an integral part of the long range language course. If you are already acquainted with this program, you have every right to be proud of its quality and its progress. If you are not yet acquainted with it, you should seek information without delay, and above all visit some of the FLES classes. You are sure to see some of the basic problems and accomplishments in language instruction in sharp relief.